Advanced
ENGLISH ESSAYS

FOR

C. S. P., P. C. S.
AND OTHER
COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS

BY

RASHID A. CHAUDRY

M. A.

Advanced Publishers

ADVANCED ENGLISH ESSAYS

VOL. I

For

(C. S. P. and other competitive examinations)

By

Rashid A. Chaudry
M.A.

ADVANCED PUBLISHERS
URDU BAZAR - LAHORE

GIFT

ADVANCED ENGLISH ESSAYS

VOL. I

For

(C. S. P. and other competitive examinations)

By

Rashid A. Chaudry

M.A.

16/12/95

ADVANCED PUBLISHERS

URDU BAZAR - LAHORE

Printed at the Nawaz Printing Press and Published by Nasir-ud-Din for Advanced Publishers Urdu Bazaar, Lahore.

For Dear Son Mehroze Jhingi
Kaizar Jhingi 16/12/95.

PREFACE

As entry into almost all high government posts is through competitive examinations in which English Essay is a compulsory paper, and there is a dearth of essay books of the required standard, the author has ventured to place in the hands of young aspirants some model essays. Every effort has been made to keep in each essay a high level of expression as well as subject-matter. The preparation of these essays has entailed very considerable labour. They furnish the student with as much material as can be expected within such a brief compass and point to the most effective means of presentation. It is hoped that these essays will meet the requirement of those for whom they are intended.

Publishers.

CONTENTS

1. POSSIBILITIES OF WORLD WAR III

Ours is a war-making civilisation. In every country of the world a major portion of the budget is allotted to defence. In the advanced countries armament factories are gcring out war-material at a tremendous speed. Scientists all over the world are busy inventing and improving upon more and more deadly weapons of war. After the Atomic bomb, the Hydrogen bomb which is much more destructive has been put in the arsenals of the big countries. Those countries which have so far lagged behind in this mad armament race are striving every nerve to come up to the level. We hear every month of the experimental explosions of these deadly bombs. In fact it seems as if the main effort of the nations of the world is devoted towards equipping themselves with the deadliest weapons, rather than towards finding something useful. They are less proud of their engineering, educational, industrial and other humanitarian works, than of their destructive achievements.

Besides the mad race for armaments, another sad feature of the modern world is that it is divided in two power-blocks—the Americans and the Russians. They are followers of two oppsite and conflicting ideologies—democratic capitalism and communism. Both sides are convinced of the righteousness of their cause, and they are bent on defeating and supplanting the other side. The result is that the smaller nations of the world, which cannot escape from the powerful influences of these two big powers, have, for their own safety, to join one or the other camp. Thus the Americans, in order to stem the tide of communism, have entered into all sorts of pacts with other nations promising them financial and military aid. North Atlantic Treaty Organisation formed by America, France, Belgium, Turkey, is glaring

example of such a move. The other such military pacts having the same objective of enriching Russia and Communist China, are the Middle East Defence Organisation, South East Asia, Treaty Organisation and the Baghdad Pact. On the other hand, the Russians are doing their best to strengthen their position, and gather more allies on their side. They are pledged to the spread of communism at any cost, and counteract the influence of Western democracies.

Besides the world being divided into two warring-camps, there is hatred and suspicious among the various nations of the world. For example there is a perpetual tussel going on between India and Pakistan over the Kashmir issue, and other such problems. In spite of the Kashmir issue being referred to the U. N. O. more than years ago, it is still hanging fire and no permanent settlement is in sight. For many years the armies of the two countries are facing each other behind ceasefire line, and with the relations between the countries as they are, there is every likelihood of an explosion at any moment. The American military aid to India has made matters still worse. We hear every day threats of war across the border, and who can tell, when they may be given an actual shape.

Another trouble spot in the world is the small Jewish country of Israel, situated among the hostile Arab nations. Israel, which has the backing of the western nations, and is ambitious to expand herself at the expense of her neighbours, is always ready to take advantage of a volatile situation. Only recently when Egypt was involved in the Suez crisis, she attacked her (Egypt) without the least provocation, and gave Britian and France an excuse to intervene on her side. It was fortunate for the whole world that the action of Britain and France was condemned by all the other countries of the world, and a major conflict on a much bigger scale was avoided. Formosa island, which lies off the coast of China, and belongs to her, is at present held by the American sponsored Chinese

Nationalist Government headed by general Chiang-Ki-Shek. This is another trouble soot, because the Communist China cannot be kept back from their rightful possession of Formosa, but the Americans, on their side, are adamant. Thus at any moment the Chinese action to seize Formosa would mean a terrible conflagaration in the pacific, and the various nations of the world being joined to one another by pacts, such a conflagration may develop into another world war.

Another factor which is fraught with danger is that, whereas imperialism and colonialism which have been given a burial in Asia, are still in their full swing in Africa. The Africans and other non-white people are being ruthlessly suppressed. This naturally means a great threat to world peace, because the Africans, having learned from the example of their Asian brethern, cannot tolerate the foreign regime for a long time. On the other hand the European nations are not in a mood to quit voluntarily. The situation is certainly fraught with danger, and there may be an explosion any moment.

Even in those countries from where the European nations have gone, they still want to retain their foothold. The way that Britain and France behaved during the Suez crisis is a glaring example of how colonialism raised its ugly head again. The actions of Britain and France in attacking Egypt, simply because she exercised her sovereign right in nationalising the Suez Canal was in instance of naked aggression on the part of European nations to curb the aspirations of those countries which have recently thrown away the foreign yoke. On the other hand, the revolt of the people of Hungary, Poland etc., against the Russian control, and the ruthless suppression that is going on there, also does not augur well for the peace of the world.

Thus we find that all over the world there is a mad race for armaments, and the two power blocks are deadly opposed to each other, and one is bent on exterminating

the other. Moreover there are so many trouble spots in the world that there may be an explosion any moment. How tragic it is that soon after terrible destruction wrought by the First World War, the nations of the world, instead of learning a lesson from it, and co-operating with one another for peace and prosperity of the whole mankind, have divided themselves into two warring, camps, and brought the world to the brink of another World War, which on account of its Atom bombs, Hydrogen bombs and rockets and what not, may prove to be the last, because after the indiscriminate use of such weapons there is little possibility of the survival of the human race.

2. UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN

For the last many years there have been persistent and at times well-founded criticisms of Pakistan universities from various quarters. The great increase in the number of students has been accompanied by a fall in the standard of attainment. Ill-equipped and ill-trained graduates have increased the number of the unemployed Their indiscipline and lack of purpose have added to the difficulties of the nation at a time when the attainment of independence has and posed great problems of reconstruction and development before the country. But a sweeping condemnation of the universities and university education is not justified. To-day it has become almost a fashion for everyone to get up and condemn all universities outright but they forget that if our universities have many defects, they have also many virtues. Now can we forget that they have made a solid contribution to the achievement of Pakistan of awakening a new political consciousness among a large number of their alumni.

In order to examine the defects and virtues of university education in Pakistan dispassionately, let us first define the main objectives of university education. In the first place, a university has to be a temple of learning and national culture where higher knowledge is pursued and

imparted; and where the mind is trained for the highest mental effort. A true University is a centre from which should emanate light that should illuminate the dark corners of the mind and obscure spaces in the universe outside. The darkness of ignorance, the clouds of superstition, the falsehood that masquerades as truth, the dim and vague shapes of prejudice and bigotry are all dissipated in its bright light. It should not be forgotten that in the pursuit of knowledge a university does not ignore the national cultural heritage of the land, and so it is a place where the achivements, traditions and values of our mind, on which the national idea is founded, are studied to make us conscious participants.

Secondly, a University has to be a human aggregate with a soul and collective will, where men of vision and faith work to make manifest the truth they cherish. It provides the corporate community life and atmosphere, the unique benefit of a common academic life with its facilities for discussion and intercourse under the superintendence and guidance of persons inspired by the highest ideals, the opportunity of "student intereducation". This is a very important feature of a University, as Newman remarked in his celebrated essay, "*The idea of a University*," that he had no hesitation in giving the preference to a university which merely brought a number of young men together for three and four years and then sent them away without doing anything and not to a university which arranged for regular lectures and conducted strict examinations.

Thirdly, a University should provide all facilities for training the youths to take proper place in the community. Goethe uttered a word of sovereign wisdom when he said that the primary vocation of man is a life of activity. But contemplation, deep thought, careful testing of one's armoury, the attainment of the requisite skill and strength must precede action if it is to be effective. One must learn not to ask of life more than it can give. One must learn

the rules of the game of life. One must acquire a sense of proportion. One must ascertain to what star one will hitch one's wagon. The students whilst at the university, must know what it is that they are fit for, and how far they may venture, and what shoals and rocks are to be avoided. Only then they are free to plunge into the fray to be in the van of public conflict, to wisely administer the State, to command the applause of listening senates, to guide the lives of others and shape their characters, to be leaders of thought.

University education thus aims at training in leadership. The academic atmosphere characteristic of university life imparts to act as a leven in the body politic. The academic atmosphere characteristic of university life imparts to those who have lived in it a quality of detachment, a habit of examining things dispassionately in the cold light of reasons without regard to extraneous or ulterior influences and considerations, a method of approach to and study of facts without prejudices and predilections—all of which are comprised in the expression "scientific spirit." A university man is presumably a reasonable man. He is also a man with an appropriate sense of values and a correct perspective of things. Having necessarily become acquainted with the best that has been taught and written, he is both a guardian and an apostle of culture.

Now taking into view these objectives, let us see how far university education in Pakistan has been able to achieve them. The fundamental question is whether university education help the student to find himself, acquire khowledge and self discipline, or does it allow his creative spirit to wither and die, under the light of false values. If we face the facts we find that the Pakistani universities today have fallen into comparative disrepute, and they do not enjoy the public esteem accorded to them in the past. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly the largely academic character of the instructions in the university, instead of developing the personality of the

tudent and enabling him to make a place in society for imself, often converts him into the unemployable. Seconly, even the standards of academic education have fallen o much that persons we have reached the highest stage re not only ill-informed and ill-educated about the affairs f the world but are sometimes ignorant of the elemantry ings in their own fields of study. Inefficiency and orruption, which have also crept into some of the lministrations, have contributed to the public's loss of onfidence in them.

Another defect of existing system of university education is its abstract and academic character. This, in itself, ould not have been so serious a defect in a country with different social background. University education must, any case, involve a degree of specialisation and abstractn. Unfortunately in Pakistan, the emphasis on the tellectual and academic aspect has been accompanied the loss of manual skills, and what is worse, a repugnce for various types of manual labour. Instead of cognising the dignity of labour, university students are ten inclined to look down upon manual work.

Unfortunately, the trend of education in Pakistani iversities has been towards easy academic studies. regular class-hours, over-crowded colleges working in ifts and smiliar ills have denied to our youth the vitality vigorous academic life. Naturally education has been a lure. It has given no mental discipline, steadfast aracter nor self-restraint; and given neither the will nor technique to work.

The defects in the universities are mainly the outcome the system which has been set up. The fact that a iversity degree is an indispensable condition for emyloynt in most types of service has induced a rush for grees and let to overcrowding in universities. As a ree is regarded as a passport to any employment, some versities felt that they should not deny this passport to ir students. There was thus a tendency to pass as many

students as possible, if necessary, even by lowering t standards. Once the downward trend began, it w difficult to check it, for any university which sought maintain a high standard faced the risk of losing its stu dents to other universities with lowered standards. Th fact that degrees are essential pre-requisites for employ ment had an undesirable effect on students as well. I made them pay more attention to the passing of examina tions than to the acquisition of knowledge. Moreove the lack of adequate financial support for the universitie leaves them with no option but to encourage the inflow into universities of as large a number of students a possible. In a situation where many of the universitie derive a major portion of their income from the tuitio and examination fees, it is difficult, if not impossible fo the university to exercise adequate control on the disciplin and standards of study of its students.

Another reason of the deterioration in the Pakistan universities is that they have stood aloof from the mai currents of Pakistani thoughts and culture. To th national movement, the student community contributed th fine frenzy of their youthful enthusiam. There were many teachers who secrificed their all for the sake of the coun- try. But the universities as such stood away from the main current of national life. The growth of new ideas, the development of modern Pakistani languages and literature, our cultural Renaissance, the rise and growth of Pakistani nationalism, new forms of collective activity which have evolved, all these, in their origin and inspiration, have been the work of men who found the universities insufficient. University men have, on the whole, chosen to stand away from the creative urges of collective life, somewhat nervous of their strength, and often unable to guide them, shuddering even at the prospect of stepping into them. The result is that our youngmen, when they leave the university, are not filled with the inspirations of the trails and triumps, the secrifice and heroism of those who lived before us. They are not given a thorough grasp

the continuity of Pakistani life through the ages. They
e not taught to respond to the vital influencss which
ve exerted themselves in various fields in Pakistan.

---

3. THE PROBLEM OF PEACE IN THE MODERN WORLD

How to secure permanent and lasting peace among
e nations of the world is the biggest problem facing
inkind today. It is far more evident now than ever
fore that peace in the modern world is a matter of peace
tween nations. Men as individuals in society have learnt
live together in peace. Cults have ceased to fight one
other except on the academic level, the riots in India
ich followed in the wake of the partition were not the
ult of any new religious differences but of the indoctri-
tion that Hundus and Muslims are two different nations.
asses are not so acutely in conflicts, as the Marxists, to
t their own ends. Races are living together in peace,
d come into conflict only on questions of naticnhood.
is thus only on the national level that man has failed
reconcile his difference and live in peace.

The problem of peace in the modern world, therefore,
nothing less than the problem of creating a world com-
inity. It is only by an enlargment of the communal
isciousness that durable peace can be attained. Some
dern thinkers assume that since the nation is but a
her rung in the ladder of man's social cohesion from
family upwards, and as men have successfully out-
wn the earlier stage of the tribe, the clan and the race
transition from the national to the international com-
nity would be easy. But it is not so easy as it seems.
ere is wider gap between the nation group and the world
nmunity than between the family and nation, and it is
nmon knowledge how very long it was before men
ld evolve into nations. Now nations can come to-
her only on the basis of something in common—a
nmon tradition, common ideals, a common foe. Man

as a whole has none of these. It is rather too late in the day to think of providing the world with a common tradition behind it ; history cannot be rewritten. Ideals on the other hand, refuse to be regimented to a pattern ; men will continue to follow varying ideals, often at cross purposes. Regarding the common foe, the possibility of an invasion from another planet is at the moment hardly more than a fancy and cannot be enlisted in the cause of bringing the nations together in the fold of a world community.

Assuming that any of these bases are possible, still it is doubtful whether the peace so attained would be durable, because wars seem to be a part of modern civilisation, and they serve a purpose which is not served by any other human agency. The global wars of our day are not wars but revolutions. They are symptoms of a deep-rooted malady. They do down to the deepest roots of our civilisation which is so prone to remedy itself temporarily by periodical upheavels. The crucial question is whether man can cut himself from this civilisation of drift. So long as the purpose which is fulfilled by war will not be fulfilled by any other means, wars will continue to disturb the even flow of life again and again.

In order to understand the purpose fulfilled by wars in the modern world, let us examine the main cause of wars, and only then we can devise some peaceful means which can fulfill that purpose. Wars spring from varied circumstances. Many factors contribute to the initiation of every war. Nationalism, imperialism, ideological conflict, economic unbalance, and the drive to dominate have all had an influence in recent wars. We, however, can best be considered as the basence of a suitable dynamic balance among the various elements of a world society. Nationalism, which means an excessive loyalty to the nation and an excess of patriotism, is, of course, the major cause of the will to war in the minds of individual men and women. And nationalism becomes the most dangerous especially when it takes the form of economic nationalism

other major cause of wars in modern times is the accu-lation of capital in the great centres of capitalism -day chiefly in U.S.A.) and its urgent demand for lusive domination of fields for foreign investment, ex-itation, raw materials, and strategic bases. The exis-ce of armament firms, which stand immensely to gain increased armies and above all by war; is also a grave nance to peace. They can incite any nation to raise munitions above the others, then turn similarly to se ot .er nations, causing a vicious spiral of increasing naments, and bringing ruin to all countries. The very stence of armies is a great cause of war. What general wish to have a small, poorly equipped army under him wish constantly to train men for work which they are er able te practise ?

Now let us consider how wars can be avoided so that foundations of an enduring peace may be laid. In the t place, there must be created among the peoples of the rld the temper of peace. In spite of serious differences, ions should approacn their problems with the basic per of peace, and not in threatening and hectoring od. In this manner England and Pakistan have set up agnificient example. In spite of long continued conflict, y have approached their problems with the temper of ee, and thus have not only resolved them, but produced, he same time, abiding understanding and friend-ship. is is the only civilised approach to problems and leaves ill-will or bitterness behind. To surrender to evil is ays bad, but in resisting evil nations must not allow mselves to be swept away by their passions and fears act in a manner which is evil itself. Even in resisting , they should always maintain the temper of peace and d out the hand of friendship to those who, through fear or other reasons, may be opposed to them.

In order to produce this temper for peace among the ple of the wrold, there must be a regular campaign of cating the masses in such a manner as to inculcate in

them the will to peace, and bring home to them the irrationality of war. This can be done by demonstrating that man is one species, that evolution has been through the growth of cooperation and through sensitiveness and awareness and not through blind struggle and the survival of the toughest.

The United Nations Organisation can also prove to be an effective instrument of peace if certain changes are made in its working. It ought to be improved so as to make the United Nations, representing world public opinion as a whole, relatively more powerful and the states representing only the opinion of particular nations less powerful? The relative power position of the United Nations can be increased by modifying the veto so that the Security Council can reach decisions rapidly and by providing contingents of armed guards so as to make it possible for the United Nations to carry out its decisions when made effectively. The Security Council can take the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security only if it is provided with collective self-defence, backed by preponderant power over most of the earth's surface.

The world at this time is divided into two rival blocs based on two opposite economic ideologies—socialism and capitalism. There are two great systems represented by Soviet Russia and U.S.A., of which one is destined ultimately to supersede the other, if not peacefully then violently. That is today the broad historical truth in the view that looks forward for many years. There can be peace in the world only if the two great powers representing two rival economic systems realise that they cannot expect settle their antagonisms by resort to war, because war can bring no decision but only common disaster. They must, therefore, instead of induliging in cold war, follow the policy of seeking for a way of living together without war.

Another way in which peace can be maintained in the world is the system of One World Govenment. Peace can reign in the world only when all states are reduced to the position of individual units in a Federation of States in which policing, peace and order are federal subjects and in which all states enjoy internal autonomy without the authority or the means of aggression, economic, social or political. In a properly representative and equitable world federation of nations, much can be achieved, and this machinery ought to be planned and installed as soon as possible.

The weight of public opinion in favour of peace will also be of immense help in ensuring peace in the world. Intensive efforts must be made all over the world for the formation of general will to peace, founded not on hatred but on love. There should also be an international ban on newspaper calumny and abuse of other countries, and all warmongering should be repressed. Everything that tends towards mutual understanding must be encouraged—tolerance should be inculcated—at all times nations should discuss calmly the claims of other countries, and realise that they have a case.

For this purpose we must listen to men of God, who have tried to inculcate love and fellowship among the people of the world. The fundamental defect in us has been that we never took our men of God too seriously, as seriously as we did for instance, our scientisits. The result is what we see ; civilisation dragged to the verge of extinction by a global war every quarter of a century. The interval, between two wars is only breathing time for us to recover from the effects of the first and prepare for the shock of the second. But if we would wake up betimes and transform the present 'uneasy peace' into real and enduring peace, and not a 'peace of the grave' we should be wise to heed our men of God better.

4. THE MENACE OF "A" AND "H" BOMBS

For thousands of years a race has been carried on between the arms of attack and those of defence. The invention of a stronger spear led to that of a new shell a more effective shell was answered by a more enduring armoured plate. But this race ended on 6th August, 1945, with a full victory for the arms of attack. Against the atomic bomb which on that day for the first time exploded over the Japanese town of Hiroshima, no means of defence has been invented or even planned.

We have, by now, been not only fully posted as to the truly marvellous nature of the atomic bomb from the Allied side, but the Japenese, on their part, have not been behind-hand in informing us of the extent of damage that was inflicted on the fortress city of Hiroshima. All living things, human and animal, the Tokio radio announced, were literally scarred to death. It added that those out-doors were burnt to death and those indoors killed by indescribable pressure and heat. Nor did it make any secret of the fact, proved scientifically, that the destructive force of the new weapon was indescribable, as was also the devastation that it caused. It concluded by saying that Hiroshima, with its population of 318,000, was a city of ruins and that the dead were too numerous to be counted. Another description was that the heat comparable to that fires had still been raging two days later.

Though the atomic bomb which exploded over Hiroshima was terribly destructive weapon, we are now told that such bomb are utterly obsolete. Not only that the new atomic bombs are 28 times stronger than those playthings of 1845, but atomic bombs as whole rank very much lower in the scale of destructive weapons. Radio-active, climatological, bacteriological bombs are 'better' because they are able to exterminate the men, animals and plants of whole countries, not only of single towns, as can be atomic bomb.

The lastest in the heirarchy of these giants destructions is the Hydrogen Bomb. It is claimed that the destructive power of the H-Bomb is six to seven hundred times greater than the Hiroshima bomb. It is in fact the deadliest weapon of mass destruction invented so far and threatens the very existence of man civilisation. We are told that there is no effective protection against this new bomb and that millions of human beings may be exterminated by a single explosion and that many more injured, and perhaps still many more condemned to slow death. The Late Prof. Einstein expressed the fear that with the invention of the H-bomb the "radio-active poisoning of the atmo phere and hence an annihilation of any life on earth, has been brought within the range of technical possibilities". We also learn that whereas the atomic bomb could be used both for destructive as well as constructive purposes, the H-Bomb was incapable of being utilised for civil or industrial purposes.

Both the U.S.A. and Russia possess H-Bombs and during the past four years they have been effecting test explosions, which are in themselves fraught with horrible consequences. The explosions of the H-bomb by the U.S.A. in 1954 in the Pacific sent a note of terror, nervousness and resentment throughout the world. Details of explosion in the little island of Bikni were not made public, and nobody knows how many people have suffered or may suffer hereafter. But reports indicated that a number of Japenese fishermen had suffered as a result of the horrible explosions; people in Japan and the neighbouring islands were afraid to eat fish because of the radio-active substance which might injure them. The position of the Government and people of India on the Hydrogen bomb and its consequences was stated by Prime Minister Nehru on April 2,1954, in a speech before the House of People, thus, "A new weapon of unprecedented power both in volume and intensity, with unascertained and probably unascertainable range of destructive potential in respect to time and space, that is, both as regards

duration and extent of consequences, is being tested, unleasing the very existence of m n and civilisation...... These are horrible prospects, and it affects us, nations and peoples everywh're, whether we are involved in wars or powers blocs or not......But mere concern is not enough, Mankind has to awaken itself to the reality and face the situation with determination and assert itself to avert calamity". Continuing the Prime Minister said that India had always advocated the prohibition of such weapons by common consent and immediately by agreement among those concerned. She had made repeated attempts at the U. N. to secure the adoption of that view and a proach. He has stated that the Government of Iadia were of the considered opinion that the experiments, tests and explosions cf such bombs should cease at once.

But the tragedy of the situation is that both the U. S. A. and Russia have not come to any agreements regarding the ban on the use of nuclear weapons, and instead of desisting from any further development in the field of destruction, are trying to outrun each other in this devilish race. They seem to be pursuing their rival economic ideologies with the same zeal, fanaticism and biogtry as the medieval crusaders. Russia and the United States represent two different ideologies and are afraid of each other. If their idologies were peaceful, it would be possible for the people of the world to make a choice between the two. But they are using means other than the peaceful and each believes that it is carrying on a crusade against the other. The Hydorgen bomb, therefore, represents this Titanic struggle between the two basic economic concepts of Capitalism and Communism, of laissez faire and totalitarianism. The United States is frantically and almost hysterically trying to stem the tide of Communism by economic aids to underdeveloped countries, through military assistance to "friendly" nations and by inventing fierce weapons of war for destroying the enemy countries. The U.S.S.R. talks loudly about peace but has been trying its hand at some kind of a Nitrogen bomb which is expec-

ted to be more powerful than even the H—bomb. Each block thinks and fondly hopes that the invention and explosions of such bombs would promote the necessary climate for world peace by frightening and 'cowing down' the enemy. But it is a fantastic and suicidal notion that the H—bomb would be helpful in averting the third world war and preserving international peace. Violence can never succeed in promoting non-violence and mutual good-will. Bertrand Russal in a recent article has expressed the hope that ultimately the rulers of the world will come to their senses, and visualises them saying : "we.........only value the bomb because it prevents war, but there is a much cheaper way of preventing war, and that is mutual admission that war can no longer further the policy of either party". But unfortunately such a situation is not yet in sight, as both sides are still in a challenging and threatening mood.

As no defence is possible against such weapons, all regular armies, with their marching soldiers, machine guns tanks, etc. are of no use for a real war. They may be good only to keep down weak colonial peoples, as the Africans, the Chinese, the Germans. But in a real war between the two great powers they do not count.

The whole human race is thus at the mercy of a few handful of individuals who control the policy of the U.S.A. and Russia. Professor Heinz Kraschutzki, a German pacificis has very aptly described the critical stituation in which the modern world finds itself, thus, "There, at Washington, in a good air-conditioned room, not too hot and not too cold, equipped with every comfort human invention can provide, some gentlemen one morning will come together to take a decision. They all are well-fed, well-clad, have slept well the preceding night, in comfortable homes, they are of good health and have strong nerves. They will hand over some maps and then quietly discuss the question where the deadly belt of uninhabitable country can best be created, that is to isolate Russia from

Europe. Is it better from Leningrade to Odessa ? Or from Riga to Salonica ? Or from Stettin via Berlin to Trieste ? They will decide this from the military point of view only. Any considerations about the millions of human lives that will perish under the atomic or other bombs when they fall in rows to create that uninhabitable region, will not be taken into account.

"And on the same day, in another comfortable room is Moscow, another group of gentlemen will come together, equally well-fed, well-clad, of perfect health and strong nerves--though of course belonging to the proletarian class-and will bend over some maps as well. They will discuss the questions whether it is better to begin with the destruction of the industrial triangle Pitsburg-Detroit-Chicago, or perhaps to start with Seattle-San Francisco-Los Angeles. They also will decide upon purely military reasons and not pause to count the millions that would have to perish here or there.

"Which of the two groups of gentlemen would be the first to give the order for the planes to start, is of little importance. We should perhaps not live to learn it. Because, the other, second in time, cannot claim to wage a defensive war. Both are aggressors, using the same means of destruction aginst which any defense is useless. Generations of juridical experts have strained their brains to find a solid definition of "who is the aggressor". Now we don't need them any longer.

"Using such means of destruction against the population of whole countries is a criminal act. Little does it matter who is the first and who the second. No criminal will find extenuating circumstances when pleading that somebody else committed the same crime five minutes earlier.

"The people have to die, men, women and children, are innocent. They have no means, neither in one country, nor in the other, to prevent their Governments for prepar-

ing for such criminal wa fare. Or is there anybody in this world who dares to say that the li.tle children that smouldered in the heat of atomic bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were guilty ? That the little children that were smashed by the falling ruins of Coventry, Warsaw, Rotterdam or Belgrade were guilty ? Or that the poor chaps that ran away with their mothers from perishing Breslen on the very night of their arrival at Dresden were burnt alive in the hospitals of that city by thousands, were guilty ? They were not. They were the innocent, all of them.

" As innocent as will be the Russian women and Children—and men ! —who will perish should the atomic belt be laid from Leningard to Odessa. As we in Berlin will be, should it be from Stettin to Triese, as the American women and children—and men –will be, should one of the two groups of gentlemen mentioned above decide that the destructive arms should be applied against Seattle or Detroit.

"And as they are innocent, all of them, are not those who venture to kiil them criminals ? Is it not a crime to kill deliberately millions of innocent people ? Remember: in case such a thing should happen both sides would deliberately kill millions of innocent people on the other side. So, are not both criminals ? Is it of any importance who starts first and who's second ? What can be done.

" I am a human individual, not more nor less. I am not responsible for anybody nor is anybody responsible for me. I speak only for myself ".

"And I declare: considering that both sides in the conflict that is menacing us are resolved to use criminal means of warfare, I cannot commit myself in the slighest way to help the one or the other.

"That is not enough, So I raise my voice and tell all those who are helping to prepare such destructive me.ns

of warfare on one side or the other. 'You are criminals' Because what you do is preparing the wilful murder of millions of innocent men, women and children.........

"May be that when they are aware that it is not glory that awaits them but the execration by the vast majority of all human beings living on this earth, that in a future history of mankind, should it survive their names will rank at the side of Chengiz Khan, Nero, Hitler perhaps might cause them to shrink back from what they are preparing".

The race for the production of Atomic and Hydrogen bombs has been going on among the great Powers. Now Britian also has got the Atomic as well as the Hydrogen bombs, and they have been tested in spite of many protests by a section of the British people. The French claim that they will have the British people. The French claim that they have the A -- bomb. Seeing the threat to humanity which the mass production of nuclear weapons engenders, and especially their tests involving letters to Mr. Khurscheev appealing to the latter to adjure the use of nuclear weapons even if the Western Powers were not willing to do so. In the course of the latter Shri C. Rajagopalachari stated, "Now that you have established beyond doubt the definite superiority of your technical achievement and potentialities which have left the opposite party dumb-founded, no gesture on your part of a peace-seeking nature can possibly be construed as arising out of desire to cover weakness. I submit, therefore, the supreme occasion for you has arrived to declare on behalf of your country that you not merely ask for an agreed ban on nuclear weapons but you will unilaterally abjure the use of these weapoos in warfare. This unqualified declaration will give the start for the moral law to work out its chain reactions in the field of human spirit even as the broken atom does in your atomic plants.

"It is not pacificism that I am asking you to declare, but only the abjuring of nuclear weapons. It is this new

development that has robbed war of all its gradualness which had been the all-important automatic safeguard for peace, humanity and civilisation to survive in spite of what would otherwise be an unqualified evil.

"It is therefore, this type of war and these new weapons of destruction that have to be abjured for the sake of civilisation. There is a point at which man's instruments unfortunately and without his knowing it, become his master instead of being his inanimate instrument. That dangerous point has been almost reached in the case of nuclear weapons. It is necessary to halt before it is too late and to restore man's control over his tools and prevent his becoming a helpless victim of his own inventions.

"It is needless for you to point out to me the lapses of the Western Power. I know them all and I have been pointing them out publicly. But a supreme moment has now arrived when your Republic can attain undying glory by a great and historic step whose moral force will be irresistible, a glory not less than Russian's heroic defence against the might and ferocity of Hitler when she bore the whole burnt of his attack. If this qualified and absolute declaration, I am suggesting, be forthcoming from you, the West will have to bow in awe and reverence before your moral height. It would be an achievement in the spiritual field no less than what you have demonstrated technology which was extorted the admiration and envy of the West.

"As you recently said in your jubilee speech in Moscow, the pattern of competition in the future will change from one of destruction to the unravelling of the mysteries of nature and the promotion of human welfare if you take this great creative unilateral step without caring what others may do or not do".

Mr. Khurschev expressing his inability to agree to Shri Rajagopalachari proposal, observed : "Realising our great responsibility for the well-being and security of

the peoples of the Soviet Union, can we lose sight of much actions of the government of Western Powers as the creation of the network of American military bases on the territories of many states in Europe, Asia, Africa along the borders of the Soviet Union and of the countries friendly to it? Have we the right to forget that the U. S. A. and its West European allies in the N. A. T. O. military block are doing their best to make the atomic and hydrogen weapons the main element of their armaments, and even declare about it officially?

"Keeping in mind all this, we fear that if the Soviet Union declares its unilateral rejection of thermo-nuclear weapons, those governments which are having evil designs against our country, blinded by their hatred towards our new system and everything that is being created by us, will yield to temptation to take advantage of the consequently weakened defensive possibilities of the Soviet Union.

They may try to deal a blow to our State with atomic and hydrogen weapons to liquidate the socialist achievements attained by the Soviet people at the cost of great efforts. And we consider the achievements of the Soviet people not only as ours but also as those of all progressive humanity, of all those who are striving to build the mutual relations among the people on the bases of equality and mutual assistance and respect".

Thus the appeal of Shri Rajagopalachari for the ban of nuclear weapons fell on deaf ears. But the Russians have now taken one jump ahead of the West, by their decision on a unilateral suspension of nuclear tests. This decision has been hailed by all peace loving people. President Tito has declared and warned other Great Powers of "immeasurable responsibility" if they continue the experiments. Unfortunately proper response has not come from the Anglo-American block, and the U.S.A. Britain are not prepared to follow the Russian example, as they suspect Russia's inttentions.

In a letter which President Eisenhower addressed to Pt. Nehru, in response to the latter's appeal for ending nuclear tests, the President stated: "To ban nuclear weapons tests at this time, in the absence of knowledge that we can go on and achieve effective limitations on nuclear weapons production and other elements of armed strength, as well as a measure of assurance against suprise attack, is a sacrifice which we could not in prudence accept. To do so could increase rather than diminish the threat of aggression and war. I believe that bolder and more far-reaching measures are required. The cessation of nuclear tests should be linked with a ban on weapons production".

Thus the Big Powers' race towards global annihilation continue, and no solution seems to be in sight.

---

5. EARTH SATELLITES AND OUTER SPACE TRAVEL

Only a few years ago earth satellities seemed destined to remain in the realm of science fiction for a long time to come. It was not until July, 1955, when the American Project Vanguard was to launch before the end of 1958 a few small satellites weighing about 20 lbs. Since 1955 the Vanguarded programme proceeded in the full glare of publicity; the design, details, the success and the setbacks were spread by a host of spokesmen, both authorised and self-appointed. In contrast little was known about the Russian plans beyond the bare statements that setellites would be laundched during 1957-58 and that they would reach higher altitude than the Vanguard. Most people outside Russia were taken by surprise when on the evening of October 4, 1957, the first Sputnik, nearly ten times as heavy as the proposed Vanguard satellite, began circling the earth. The Russians were congratulated from all sides on their fine achievement. Stronger superlatives were needed on November 3, when a second and much heavier Sputnik appeared and the presence of a live dog inside

attracted public interest, astonished the scientists, and dismayed the dog-lovers.

Whereas the Sputnik I filled the whole world with admiration for Russia's technical and scientific advancement, the launching of the Sputnik II startled the world. The second sputnik was much bigger than the first one, it weighed about half a ton (the first one was 183 lbs) and was circling the glove every 102 minutes at an altitude of 930 miles. The first sputnik circled the world every 96.2 miutes. The longer time required by the second sputnik was not due to any slower speed (it had the same speed of 18,000 miles per hour as the first one), but due to its higher orbit. Another significant thing about the second sputnik was that it was carrying a living being a dog named Laika, who it was hoped, could be brought down to earth. This last expectation, however, did not come true and Laika was reported—in other words, the problem of getting down living being from space ships remained still a problem.

Professor Anatoli Biagonaravov, one of the architects of these magnificent Soviet achievements, said, "I think the new date of the second sputnik will astound the world even more. There will be even greater admiration at the success of our science". In Toronto, Dr. John "Heard, Director of Toronto University Observatory said, "The announced weight of the satellite is almost incredible we were all amazed at the weight of the first satellite, but it is really astonishing that Russians put in this much weight". In London, Professor Massey of the Royal Society for the achievement of science, described the second satellite as "really a most fantastic development".

U. S. army scientists at New Mexico missile bases and Mr. Kenneth Gatland, Vice-Chairman of the British Interplanetary Society, estimated that the whole satellite unit must have weighed about 500 tons and required 1·25 million lbs. of fuel (on the accepted basis that it took

1000 lbs of fuel to lift one pound into the orbit). Dr. Fred Whipple, Director of Astro-Physical Observatory in Cambridge, Massachusetts, described the launching of the second satellite as six times as great a scientific achievements as the launching of the first sputnik.

The Russian scientists who were responsible for launching the Sputniks, said that Sputnik I had two principal purposes; to give accurate measurement of the destiny of the atmosphere of high altitude above the earth and to obtain information about meteoric streams in outer space. Sputnik II was intended to prove about the effect of cosmic rays on living beings and to study the spectrum. The second satellite was equipped with a refracter which splitted the spectrum into separate colours and enabled the scientists to study the Sun's rays unaffected by atmosphere.

It was on February 1, 1958, that the United States also launched its first earth satellite, named the "Explorer". The launching of the first American satellite, came exactly 17 weeks after the Soviet Union sent up her first "Sputnik" into space. The "Explorer" weighs 30.8 lbs and its speed is between 18,000 and 19,400 miles an hour. It circles the globe in about 123 minutes. It is in firm orbit so perfectly on course that it may remain aloft as long as ten years. It contains instruments to measure cosmic rays, meteorites and temperatures, and two radio transmitters, to broadcast this information to earth. President Eisenhower announced that any information received from the U. S. satellite would be made available to the scientific community as a whole. He said that the launching was "part of our country's participation in the international geophysical year".

The Soviet Union is well as the U. S. A. are going ahead with the programme of launching further satellites into space. The U. S. army launched a second "Explorer" on March, 5, 1958. Russia launched her third Sputnik,

the largest man made satellite so far, on May 15, 1958. It is 18,000 lbs heavier than the half-ton Sputnik II, which carried the space-dog Laika. It is especially designed to land again intact. The extra weight suggests that a special heavily protected cone has been created in an effort to solve the problem of its re-entry through the earth's atmosphere without being burned up—as the previous Sputniks were. The weight may also indicate an advance in the conquest of gravity. It carries nearly a ton of scientific apparatus including solar batteries and a radio transmitter. It is speeding round the earth every 106 minutes and the highest point of its orbit is 1,175 miles. It has been launched, as the Russians say, under the International Geophysical Year programme, and its purpose is to conduct research in the upper layers of atmosphere and in cosmic space.

To appreciate what has been achieved by the launching of satellite, we should compare the satellite with its humbler antecedents. A man-made satellite falls into the category of ballistic missiles. These are to be sharply distinguished from air-borne vehicles, like aeroplanes, which welcome the presence of the air and persuade it to help them by providing lift. A ballistic missile, on the other hand, functions by reaching as high a speed as possible initially, and then, by virtue of its momentum, going as far as it can before gravity pulls it to earth. The air is merely a nuisance because it reduces the speed and hence the distance covered. Ballistic missiles, ancient and modern, have been most prominent in war—stones flung from a catapult, cannon balls, shells, intercontinental rockets. It is the initial speed which chiefly determines how far these missiles go; and the satellite surpasses its forerunner because it can attain a higher speed.

The range covered by a ballistic missile before it hits the ground varies roughly as the square of its initial speed. Thus a missile with a speed of one mile per second will go about 200 miles, the German V 2 rocket of

1944 being a typical example. With a speed of 2 miles per second a missile will go nearly 1,000 miles. Four miles per second gives a range of 4,000 miles, the so-called intercontinental ballistic missile (I.C.B.M.). With a speed of 5 miles per second the missile does not fall to the ground, but circles the earth as a satellite. Gravity does its best to pull the missile back but only succeeds in it from receding further. With a speed of 7 miles per second the missile can escape from the earth altogether and wonder through the solar system.

From these figures we see that the stop from an intercontinental missile (4 miles per second) to a satellite (5 miles per second) is comparatively small, and the satellite, if it weighs much less than the warhead of the missile, may be a rather easier proposition. The second sputnik, weighing half a ton, can scarcely be called a lightweight, however. Placing Sputnik II in its orbit must have been as difficult as sending off an intercontinental missile, though the speed and direction of the Sputnik not would need to be so accurate.

With the launching of earth satellite by the Soviet Union and U S.A., the first step in the conquest of space has been taken and it may ultimately lead to manned space flight. Referring to the further developments which are possible in this field, Mr. Patrick Moore, Fellow of the Roayl Astronomical Society has observed in his article, The Invasion of Space: "The first step in the conquest of space has been taken, and we must now look ahead and see what will come next. The Russians have said that within the next few years they should be able to give us information which we could not obtain in any other way—not only about conditions in space, but about the Moon itself. By means of telescopes, astronomers should be able to see the rocket land on the lunar surface. After, the Moon the nearer planets are Mars and Venus. Mars, at least, is a much more welcoming world than the airless and lifeless Moon, but it a lot further away, and

even an unmanned rocket would take months to get there. Moreover, the increased distance would mean that to observe the impact of the rocket upon Mars would be difficult.

"It is one thing to talk about sending unmanned rockets to other worlds, what, however, about our ultimate aim—manned space flight ? So far, men have not been able to rise more than a few miles above the ground. One trouble has been that we do not know enough about conditions we are likely to meet. There is still some doubt as to the extent of the cosmic-ray danger, and we do not also know just how the human body will react when it is in a condition of free-fall, to use the scientific term, all sensation of weight has diappeared. We must remember the old cliche of 'learning to walk before trying to run' proves good in space flight as it does in everything else. The launching of satellites represents our first faltering step. Once we master the art of 'walking', we shall be able to consider breaking into a trot.

'The Russians say that, within ten years, unmanned rockets should have been sent to Mars and Venus. I am quite prepared to believe this, though getting the rockets back will be tremendously difficult. Within about 15 years manned rocket flight should have been acheived. Men should have made trips round the Earth above the atmosphere, and returned safely.

"If all goes well, this should lead on to an actual flight to the Moon. The first trip will be in the nature of a reconnaissance. The outward journey will take only five days or so and, allowing another five days for return and a certain period on the Moon itself, the total expedition will not be a long drawn-out affair. The pioneers will leave equipment on the Moon's surface, both to continue transmitting information and for the use of future parties. If all goes well—and I want to stress this qualification—the first man should have landed within 25

years. A successful first expedition will lead to others and the establishment of a true lunar base.

"The future indeed is intriguing. Within our own lifetime, we have already seen the first artificial satellite. We shall almost certainly see unmanned vehicles reaching the moon. There is at least a good chance that we shall see the first journey from one world to another. And we may even see the beginning of lunar colonisation. It is not too much to say that we are living in the most exciting period in the whole history of mankind".

Already programmes are a fort in Russia and the U.S.A. for launching progressively bigger and more complex scientific satellites in the coming year, which would be but "the prelude to the drama to follow" —manned flight into outer space. Recently leaders of the United States satellite programme have recommended to the Administration a long range programme of space research looking toward exploration of the moon and plannets and manned space flight. In their report they stated : "The interests of human progress and our national welfare now demand that a long-term programme of space exploration be formulated and pursued by the United States with the utmost energy. Although there will inevitably be benefits from such a programme, the basic goal of this exploration must be the quest of knowledge about our solar system and the universe beyond. It is impossible to predict at present how quickly man himself will follow his exploring instruments into outer space, the ultimate culmination of his efforts will be manned space flight and his landing on the nearer planets. It is clear that he can develop the ability to do this, and it is hard to conceive of mankind stopping short when such a tempting goal is within reach".

President Eisenhower has also made public a forecast by scientists that it might cost a couple of billion dollars "to equip ourselves to land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth". Here are some of the statements

made by the U.S Scientific Advisory Committee concerning problems and potential of exploring outer space.

1. "Study of the moon through the use of instrumented robots rocketed up there could interest scientists for many decades—but man is such an "adventurous creature" that he cannot resist going to see for himself. Manned flight to the moon, with return journey, might not arrive in this century—or it might come within one or two decades.

2. "How much money? According to one rough estimate it might require a total investment of about a couple of billion dollars, spent over a number of years, to equip ourselves to land a man on the moon and to return him safely on earth. A couple of billion dollars was the cost for developing the first atomic bomb and is considerably less than the current expenditure for the big missile programme.

3. Even before journeying to the Moon, to Mars or to Venus, the artificial earth satellite can provide vast benefits for man. Two or three weather-watching satellites could survey the whole globe in a few hours, tell of gathering storms, spot hurricans, and chart their direction. They can provide virtually trouble-free relay points to link the earth's communications. With them, tests can be made of Einstein's general Theory of Relativity. They would provide answers to the question of how intense is casmic radiation from space before it filtered down through earth's atomphere. From then, science can peer with undistorted vision out into space to see "new sights for ever hidden from observers who are bound to earth".

6. DISARMAMENT

A terrible armament race is going on into the world, especially between the two most powerful countries— the

USSR

U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. Besides the huge quantities of conventional weapons, there are large stock-piles of Atoms and Hydrogen bombs, as well as long-range missiles. The cost of all these weapons is tremendous, and all this wasteful expenditure on a huge scale is going on, when the world has to fight against hunger, disease and poverty which hold a large section of humanity in their grip. It is really most dangerous situation, as the mad armament race, if not properly controlled and stopped, will lead the world to annihilation, and wipe out the entire human race. Since August 6 and 9, when under the orders of the then President of the U.S.A., Mr. Truman, two atomic bombs were dropped on Japan to compel her to accept terms of surrender, newer and deadlier weapons have been discovered and are being tested in spite of warnings from scientists and statements regarding their evil effects. In his famous speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower declared :

'Atom bombs today are more than 25 times as powerful as the weapons with which the atomic age dawned, while hydrogen bombs are still many times more powerful than the atom bombs. Today the United States' stockpile of atomic weapons which, of course, increases daily, exceeds by many times the total equivalent of all bombs and shells that came from every plane and every gun in every theatre of war through all the years of world War II. A single air group, whether afloat or land based, can deliver to any reachable target a destructive cargo exceeding in power all the bombs that fell on Britain in world War II. In size and variety the development of atomic weapons has been such that atomic weapons have virtually achieved status within our armed forces. In the United States, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps are all capable of putting the weapon to military use".

This was the situation in 1953. Since then the stockpiles of Atomic and Hydrogen bombs have con-

siderably increased as besides the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union, the U. K. also now possesses atom as well as hydrogen bombs, and thus the arsenals of these countries are stored with terribly destructive weapons which can wipe out the whole humanity out of existence in no time.

In 1957, the armament race between the great powers entered a new phase, when on August 26, the world stumbled into the era of the ultimate weapons. The terse Soviet statement told the world that Russian had successfully fired an intercontinental ballistic missile, which flying "at a very high, unprecedented altitude" and " covering a huge distance in a brief time ", hit its target; the result showed that " it is possible to direct rockets into any part of the world ". In other words, the Soviet Union was in possession of a tested weapon which could fly unmanned across the ocean and hit large cities and industrial centres in the United States with nuclear explosives. The ballistic missile tested in Russia in August is believed to have a range of 5,500 miles that is, launched from Russia, it could have hit targets in the North American continent. Missiles of inter-continental range are called Inter-continental Ballistic Missile (ICBM). There a e other rockets of intermediate range, with a speed of about 1500 miles. They are known as Intermediate Range Ballistice Missiles (IRBM)

The Soviet Union took to missile project with greater earnestness than the U. S. A. and for good reasons. The United States has a network of advances bases around the Soviet territory from which it could, in war, attack Russia with super-bombers and short-range missiles. For the nations of Western Europe, this ring has been the greatest guarantee that the U. S. would apply its policy of massive retaliation at short notice, if there were aggression from Russia. For the U. S. S. R. there was no comparable advantage. The nearest continental target in the United States is several thousand miles away.

Even to hit back at the bases in the ring Russia needs missiles of intermediate range.

The Soviet Union' therefore, concentrated on the development of ballistic missiles. Durding t..e Suez crisis Mr. Bulganin's famous message to Britian created a far greater impression in Washington with its frank reference to rocket warfare than with its grandiloquent pose as an ultimatum. The Soviet Premier's warning. " And there are coun ries now which need not have sent a navy or air force to the coast of Britain, but could have used other means such as rockets" was clevery designed to announce to the world that Russia was in possession of a sizable stock of IRBMS.

The ICBM in the hands of Russia vitally alters the global stragetic balance of power. With the IRBM, Russia can effettively retaliate against the ring of Ameriear *avance* basis. With the ICBM she can deliver nuclean bombs on American cities and industrial centres. With the IRBM Russia can hit, in Europe, targets in Greece, Italy and the whole of Britain. Launched from East Germany and Czechoslovakia, the IRBM has within its range Ireland, half of Spain and the whole of North Africa.

In East Asia, almost all the western defence outposts, from Japan to South Viet Nam, fall within the range of IRBM, launched from the Soviet East of China. A 5,5000-mile ICBM launched from Russia's Arctic bases can deliver nuclear explosive over the whole of Canada and the Uni ed States, right up to the bo der of Mexico. Launched from the south-eastern and south-western Soviet bases. It has within its range considerable areas of the Central and Western United States.

By launching Sputnik I and Sputnik II, the Soviet Union proved to the whole world that she actually

possessed ICBM. In order to meet this challenge President Eisenhower made an emergency request to the American Congress to provide Rs. 630 crores in addition to the regular military budget for Rs. 4,450 crores, and the U. S. scientists have to a great extent succeeded in making the ICBM, though not as powerful and accurate as that of the Russians. There is thus a kind of parallelism and symmetry in this missile-and-rocket race between the two powers. The Americans held the lead at one time, but the Russians are now believed to be able to pay back in the same coin and pay even more with their new mastery of missilery. Thus with the opening of each fresh phase of military technology the race grows more tense and ghastly. The Russians have the present satisfaction of holding a lead in these new dangerous fireworks. The Americans, under the spur of Soviet success, have been roused to believe that no amount is too large for meeting the Soviet challenge. The costs involved in this suicidal race will stagger less fortunate nations suffering from shortage of funds and eager to wage a war against poverty and misery. The Russians and the Americans also cannot be remarkably happy about the burdens they have to bear. An Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile costs about Rs. 30 crores; and on purely military considerations there can be no end to making Russian missiles and American missiles. The magnitude of the cast of missile-making is by itself fantastic a part from the horrors of ultimate desruction.

Thus the way out of present impasse is disarmament, putting an end to any further manufacturing of such dangerous bombs-atom and hyndrogen bombs and missiles. This inexorable armament race will surely hurl the whole world into the pit of destruction. Disarmament is at present a vital necessity for all. If the world continues to live very long in the state of present tension with the West- armed to the teeth-accosted by the armed Soviet Union-we might have to witness colossal destruction even if there is no war. The following news-item is a

pointer of the future of the nations in the meanwhile fail to agree on complete disarmament:

" Moscow, January 12, 1958-Asrmen who make regular flight in arcraft carrying atom or hydrogen bombs are liable to sudden fits of mapness which could lead to the extermination of hundreds of thousands of human lives, according to a Soviet psychiatrist, Tass reported today.

" The psychiatrist, prof. Vassily Blanschchikov, said: The danger is all the more real as often no warning sign permits the detection of the approach of a fit of madness, because in most cases it is a question of men considered as perfectly mormal ".

"The psychiatrist said that the only way of avoiding such a risk was the forbidding of such flights".

"Factors that tend to produce such mental derangements are, according to Prof. Blanschchikov, "Continuous stresses, mental or physical fatigue and other factors which weaken the nervous system and the body as a whole. Many of these are the inevitable corollary of the pilots' difficult and strenuous work. Especially significant is the fact that the airmen are continually subjected to the effects of frequent change in atmospheric pressure and of highly rarefied air. This effects such major functions of the body as blood circulation and respiration and has a considerable effect on higher nervous activity.

This means that, war or no war, there would be the risk of atomic bombing so long as atom bombs exist and that no country is safe from the threat. Paradoxically enough, in a time of peace it is the possessor country that runs the greatest risk in so far as the slighest error on the part of anyone concerned in the process of manufacture and transport of nuclear weapons—a possibility now stated to be very real and thus all the more threatening—would result in the destruction of hundreds of thousands of

human lives. All these lead to the imperative need for immediate disarmament

Negotiations on disarmament between the great powers of the world have been going on under the auspices of the U. N. since its very inception. Unfortunately no useful results have been obtained. The game of disarmament talks was played in its final phase at the Disarmament Sub-Committee meetings in London from May 1957 August 1957, but the arduous negotiations for a first stage disarmament failed. By rejecting the Western package proposals, Soviet Celegate Mr. Zorin dashed to the ground the high hopes officially raised a few months earlier, and carefully sustained through many bleak weeks that the Powers were nearer an agreement than ever before, Ultimately they proved to be as far away from one another as always in the eleven years of disarmament talks.

In order to prove that they are sincere in their intentions to effect disarmament, the Russians banned the test of nuclear weapons and U. K., to do the same. But the Western Powers have refused to follow suit, as they insist that suspension of tests must be accompanied by a suspension of the production of fissionable material to which they knew Russia would not agree, since she was lagging far behind the United States in this field. President Eisenhower, on the other hand, has made a proposal to the Russians for the control of outer space for military use as the first stop to disarmament, but the Russians have announced that they will consider this proposal only if the U.S. agrees to discuss the liquidation of U.S. military bases in Europe and West Asia.

In insisting that Mr. Eisenhower's proposals for outer space can be considered only if the American bases in Europe and West Asia are liquidated. Russia is as much justified as the U.S.A. refuses to accept an unconditional ban on nuclear tests unless the production of fissionable materials is subject to international control. Such con-

ditionalism in which the tendency is in favour of a package deal (control over all sorts of weapons) is in some degree unavoidable. Such advantages as have been acquired by the Soviet union by its progress in outer space cannot be surrendered without a kind of exchange of some kind, and the same principle is applicable when the Western Powers find that they cannot surrender their "H" bombs and bases unless the Russian superiority in land forces is appreciably reduced.

Fearful that the other may acquire an advantage howevre temporary, both the East and the West refuse to accept anything less than a package solution though every month that passes increases the range of insecurity in all directions and the package settlement necessarily becomes more and more unwieldly.

At present negotiations are going on between Russia and the U.S.A. to hold Summit Talks, in which the question of disarmament will be fully discussed. The Soviet Union has proposed a four-point programme for consideration at an East-West Summit conference. The points are :

1. Prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes and an undertaken to launch rockets into outer space only in accordance with an agreed international programme.

2. Liquidation of foreign bases on territories of other countries, first of all in Europe, West Asia and North Africa.

3. Establishment within the framework of the U.N. of adequate international control to supervis commitments contained in points 1 and 2.

4. Creation of a U.N. organ for international cooperation in outer space rssearch which would fulfil the following functions :

(*a*) To work out an international programme for the launching of the intercontinental and outer space rockets, to study space and control implementation of the programme.

(*b*) To serve as a world centre for the collection mutual exchange and dissemination of information on outer space.

(*c*) To co-ordinate national scientific research plans on the study of outer space and to co-operate in their implementation.

The four-point plan which has been submitted by Russia for discussion at a summit conference is a vivid illustration of the manner in which the problem of disarmament, initially confined to conventional weapons. has been inflated with the injection of new complexities into a matter too extensive to be covered by any single formula. Each successive stage towards greater complication has posed probiems that could not be solved without reference to the preceding stage until to-day the control of outrr space involves repercusstons that reach far back to the conventional weapons in which the current armament race originated. If the control of the atom bomb was not possible in isolation without regard to conventional arms, similar control of outer space is obviously impracticable without regard to hydrogen bombs and military bases.

Commenting on the present trends in negotiations about disarmament between Russian and the Western Powers. The Times of India, wrote in its leading article of the 20th May, 1958 ; "In their recent interchange of idea on the subject of disarmament both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev have displayed a degree of resiliency that is somewhat unusual in a matter which has for so long been dominated by rigid and uncompromising attitudes. It is premature to suppose that what appears to be a new willingness to reconsider past commitments signifies any fundamental or immediate policy deviation of kind that

would make the disarmament problem considerably less intricate than it actually is. Yet it is reason enough for restrained optimism that many within the Eisenhower administration including Mr. Dulles himself are now inclined to regard an unconditional ban on nuclear tests as both feasible and desirable. Equally encouraging is the Soviet willingness to cooperate in investigating the technical aspects of detecting nuclear tests in peace times. These represent a fairly encouraging departure from previous attitude and justify the belief that the combined weight of international opinion and the revolutionary implications of long-range weapons that have recently been developed has impelled the governments concerned to undertake a more than usually searching reappraisal of their disarmament policies. In these developments there are possibilities of a fruitful exchange of ideas not merely on the special issue of a nuclear ban but on disarmament question in general"

Let us hope that in the near future the two power-blocs would arrive at a workable solution of the disarmament problem, so that humanity may be saved from the impending disaster. Disarmament is very essential, and only on an agreed solution of this intricate issue, the future of the human race depends.

---

7. THE MIDDLE EAST

The Middle East today is an international cockpit. Hardly a day passes without bringing a news of disturbance from the Middle East. Ever since the dawn of civilization the Middle East has been the storm centre of history. Endless Forces have tried to subjugate it in their time—Babylonians, Carth aginians, Hittitles, Persians, Spartans, Greeks, Romans, Crusaders, latterly the British and French. Nobody lasted long historically. At present the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. are making a bid for the

control of the Middle East.

It is not easy to define the Middle East, even geographically. It is sometimes held to include everything from Algiers to India, from the Bosphorus to the Sudan. More conveniently, it is that interlocking complex of lands linking the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf—literally the Crossroads of the World. It is here that the three continents meet—Europe, African and Asia, and where also meet diverse people, diverse languages and cultures and customs. Here meet the violent racial forces like the Greeks, the Turks, Arabs, Jews, Egyptians, Persians and the like. It is an area rich in natural resources and raw material especially oil. In fact the Middle East sits on top of two-thirds of all known oil reserves. It also provides a vital route between the East and the West. Oil, plus geography promoted a meaningless desert to an international cockpit.

The countries in the Middle East are Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. The Middle East is not a homogenous area. It would be rather correct to state that there are Arab-speaking peoples in the Middle East than Arab States. Race and religion provide closer bonds of union among the people of the Middle East than the concept of nationality. Both the Arabs and the Jews are Semetic people, but the Jews are outside the tide of Arab Nationalism. The Arab-speaking peoples are mostly Muslims, but there are many Christian Arabs of different sects, as for example, in the Lebanon. Muslim Arabs are divided between Sunni and Shia and this division provides a basis for separation politics, as it is in Iraq. The Muslims of Saudi Arabia are practically all Sunnis, and there are no Jews at all. All Jews have gone to Israel. There are quite a number of Christians in Egypt, Iraq, and the Lebanon, and Israel. More than half of the population of Lebanon is Christian, and the rest Muslim.

Up to the end of the first world war, there were practically no Middle East problems of the magnitude and type that have emerged today. With the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish suzerainty over these smaller states of the area ceased. There developed in the immediate post-war years what was known as Pan-Arabism. The supporters of this doctrine believed that the Arabs, because they spoke Arabic, a language different from Turkish, were *ipsoy facto* entitled to secede from the Ottoman Empire and to form a State where everybody who spoke Arabic would be included. Originally, the Pan-Arabism, aimed at securing a dislodgement of the French from Syria and the Lebanon and the suppression of Zionist activities in Palestine and subsequently the formation of a unitary or a federal Arab State. During the period of the second world war, that is, between 1933 to 1945 a different concept of Pan-Arabism took its birth. In the new scheme there was no idea for the amalgamation or federation of States; it aimed at securing an alliance of sovereign States of the region. In the subsequent development, Egypt unexpectedly figured as the leader. But the concept of Pan Arabism drifted away on account of the inner countraditions of the States of the Middle East. The dynamic feuds and rivalries among the States in this region were greatly responsible for the failure of the Pan-Arabic movement.

The post-war years have witnessed a cleavage in the Middle East alliance and Arabism has virtually come to an end. The Baghdad Pact and the Middle East Defence Organisation have divided the countries of this area. Iraq is a member of the Baghdad Pact and as such she is linked thereby with Turkey, Persia and Pakistan under the overall alliance of the United Kingdom. Jordan, so long under Egyptian influence, has now broken away from country until very recent times, Jordan was a sphere of influence of the British Empire, but w th the dismissal of Glubb Pasha the British influence has waned and the star of the U.S.A. has risen in the political horizon of

Jordan. Since the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, Egypt has been bidding to be the leader of the Middle Eastern countries. Egypt today is bitterly hostile to Iraq, because Iraq is an ally of Britan. Egypt today is an ally of Soviet Russia. Syria is bitterly anti-French and anti-British and pro-Russian. Syria and Saudi Arabia have recently joined hands with Egypt in many issues of the Middle East, although peculiarly enough Saudi Arabia is now under the influence of the U. S. A. The oil fields of Saudi Arabia are being exploited by oil companies of the U.S.A. and the oil royalties are the main sources of the income of Saudi Arabia. Israel fully belongs to the Anglo-American alliance, and the Lebanon, half of whose population are Christian, is afraid of Syria.

After the suez Crisis the U. K. and France lost their hold on the Middle East countries, and from the pointof view of American strategy a "Vacuum" was created. To oppose Russian inflitration, the U. S. A. devised the Eisenhower Doctrine. The Middle East will not only be the main battle - ground of the future war, it will influence the scale of war. The power that will control the oil fields of the Middle East will consideiably control the destiny of the war to come. In 1918, Britain replaced the Turkish Suzerainty over the Middle East. Then there was no power to rival her claim. The U. S. A. was indifferent to the happenings in the Middle East and Russia was busy with her own internal upheavals. But now Britain had to yield to the growing influence and power of the U. S. A. Britain today is no match for the Soviet Russia whether in the battle of diplomacy or in the might of arms to cope with the growing influence of the Soviet Russia in this region. The U. S. A. has to step in in order to keep the Russisns at bay, and at the same time to oust British oil monopolies from the area.

The Eisenhower Doctrine, which aims at helping the Middle East countries militarily and finacially in order ro oppose the Russian infiltration in this area,

has been subject of great controversy. It was in January, 1957, when the British and the French had evacuated the Suez zone, that president Eisenhower asked that American Congress for authority to use American armed forces," as he deems necessary" to aid any nation or group of nations asking aid to combat "overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international Communism". Though some of the U. S. Congressmen criticised the Eisenhower proposal in terms like "blan cheque" authority, loaded dynamite" and declaring war "on a delayed basis—ahead of time, "the president got the required authority. Defending the Eisenhower proposal, Mr. Dulles told the Congress "There are othere dangers in the largely underdeveloped area besides the possibility of an armed communist attack. There is the possibility of subversion, a danger which is idcreasing if there be a sense of insecurity. There is the danger that econmic conditions could be such as to make Communism seem an attractive choice. Any U. S. programme, to be adequate, must he prepaed to meet armed Communist attack, subversion or economic instability and any combination of them.

"The danger cannat be met under present conditions unless we meke clear now, in relation to the Middle East what we have already made clear in relation to so many areas namely that armed Communist attack would have to be met, if need be, by the armed forces of the United states. Only thus can we adequately serve the cause of freedomand peace.

"A Communist break-through in the Middle East would be a disater reaching far beyond the confines of that area. It would enceurage Soviet rulers to resort every--where to more aggressive policies. It would severly weaken the pressure within the Soviet world for more liberal policies.

"The Eisenhower programme is not designed to impose outside pelicies on West Asian nations, but rather to h elp

them, safeguard their cherf cherisehd national and cultural freedom. Soviet demination would be a political disaster for them, because then those nations, like the European satellites, would lose the national indepenednce which they so ardently desire and which now they are beginning to exercise in all measures. It would be an economic disaster because the principal economic asset of this area is petroleum, and only the free nations offer an adequate market. It would also be a disaster for the peoples of the Middle East because they are deeply religious peoples and their spiritual sufferings would be grievous if they were subjected to the fate of other religious peoples who have fallen under the rule of atheistic materialistic Communism."

The Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East, though hailed by pro-west countries, has met with a severe criticism from many quarters. A statment issued by "Tass" agency, quoting authoritative Soviet circles said, "The U. S. A's main concern is not the peace and the national independence of the Arab countries but to try to take advantage of the weakning of Britain and France in West Asia to seize their possitions. At present when a situation favourable for building up peace in West Asia has arisen, the U S. Government has come out with a programme envisaging flagrant U. S. interference in Arab affairs and even goes as far as envisaging military intervention. The U. S. A. is trying to restore the former colonial order in the area under a new signboard and aims at seizing key positions. Authoritative Soviet circles believe that the programme planned by the U. S. A. for action in West Asia might lead to dangerous consequences and that all responsibility for them falls on the U. S. Government."

A Peking Daily criticising the Eisenhower Doctrine wrote; " The actions of the U. S. which has launced new and broader measures for the enslavement of the nations of the Middle East have further sharpened international

tension. The Eisenhower Doctrine is an expression of these colonialist aims of the U. S. The interests of the people of the Middle East and the general interests of maintaining peace and order in this area demand that all Governments exert their efforts to liquidate the remnants of aggression in Egypt and not to permit interference of any sort in the affairs of the nations of middle East and to support their sovereignity and independence".

The Cairo press expressed fears that President Eisenhower's policy of " Vacuum filling " could lead to world War III. One of the papers wrote: America's efforts to fill an alleged vacuum will justify interference of one State in the affairs of another. Russia, for instance, may put it into her head tomorrow that there is a 'vacuum' in Greece, Sweden, Norway or Iran and that she should do something about it. There is no doubt that the inevitable result of such a trend is war, which will become the only arbiter.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari commenting on the Eisenhower Doctrine sarcastically stated: "British policy having miscarried, we are told by the West that there is now a moral as well as a military vacuum in West Asia. According to Western nations, any rich area withont some Western power or other occupying it or dominating the spot is a vacuum. The West says that Russia may commit aggression; that such a possibility must be anticipated and countered. How? By mar ching in and posting U. S. forces there under the prov sions of Article 51 of the U. N. charter. The unfortunate Arab countries possess oil. Blessed are they that do not possess wealth?

Mr. Nehru, referring to " the so-called power vacuum" and the efforts of the U. S. A. or Russia to fill it, stated in the Parliament, " It is fraught with the greatest danger to the peace of the world. If I may put the

situ tion in another way, vacuum have been created and are being created in the Middle East. Vacuum cannot exisr for long-power vacuums. Now there is a vacuum and wherever there is a vacuum, danger arises. In my opinion, such a vacuum has to be filled by the countries of the region through their strength, unity and progress".

The Eisenhower Doctrine has succeeded to a certain extent in resisting the Russian influence in the Middle East and especially it has weaned away Jordan from the influence of Egypt, which is a Russian ally But Western diplomacy in West Asia has suffered a major setback with the proclamation of the United Republic of Egypt and Syria, in February, 1958. Soviet diplomacy, on the other hard, has reaped one more rich harvest. The urge for the Syro-Egyptian Union came from the Western attempts to isolate these two countries from the rest of the Arab world and to bring them down with all kinds of economic and political pressure, as they stood in the way of the U. S. plans to organise the Middle East into a bastion of the wes and to keep it from Soviet intervention. The Soviet Union entered the arena and faced the west as the most formidable champion of Egypt and Syria. She blessed the merger move for obvious reasons. It spelt a glaring defeat for the Western move to isolate and weaken Egypt and Syria and thereby liquidate Soviet influence. It was a spectacular achievement of the Arab's long unfulfilled dream of unity. It brought the area of extreme nationalism, where Soviet prestige was the highest in the Egpytain bloc, is against Britian, and has accepted the Russian aid, has also joined the U A. R.

Thd five hundred million dollars worth of Soviet assistance would be pouring into the United Arab Repablic and its army-far outnumbering the combined armed strength of Iraw, Jordan and Lebanon and Saudi Arabia-would be trained and equipped by he Soviets. As both Syria and Egypt are mediterranean countries, the Soviets would get a much desired outlet to the sea. The most

vital life-lines of Europ:-the suez canal and the pipeline (which runs through Syria) would also come under a measure of Russian influence. Neither Syria nor Egypt minds this so long as Russia does not interfere in the conduct of their free governments. For them, Russia is the only effective guard against the restoration of wes-tern dominance.

As a counter move to the Syrian-Egyptian merger the Western Powers have brought about the hashemite federa-tion of Iraq and Jordan Th two kings-king Feisal of Iraq, and king Hussein of Jordan, who are cusins, proclai-med on February 14, 1958, the merger of their two coun-tries. The protagonists of Egypt-Syria merger are against the emergence of the new prowestern alliance in West Asia. According to some observers who visited Jordan recently, the "Kings" Union' is dragging badly in sharp an antrust to the dynamic progress towards administr-ative consolidation in the two regions of the United Arab Republic. While President Nasser is in effective control of the U. A. R., no dominant authority to co-ordinate organs of power has yet emerged in the rival Arab state.

Another recent development which may go against the western powers is the installation of Crown Prince Feisal, the brother of king Saud, in power in Saudi Arabia. The almost unanimous view of the press is that the shift presages a new wave of anti-Westernism in Saudi Arabia. The U. S. A. which has neavy oil interests in Saudi Arabia has till now depended heavily on king Saud providing him with American advisers, not to speak of oil royalties. Whether Prince Feisal will be equally pliable to American advice or whether he will turn out to be aggressively anti-American remains to be seen; Prince Feisal's coming to power, however, enables him, if he so wants, to oppose the style of political architecture which the U. S. A. has so far laboriously built in Middle East alliances.

No moves that can be described as being "wild" are expected from Prince Feizal, as he has to recken with the huge oil interests, but Saudi Arabia and Egypt, presumably, will be on closer and happier terms from now on. It this means that Saudi Arabia will sooner or later enter into some manner of loose federation with the United Arab Republic, a consummation most devoutly hoped for by Cairo, it would be reasonable to expect a new pattern of Middle East diplomacy.

Thus the situation in the Middle East remains, as over, fluid. On account of group rivalries, and active intervention of the two power-blocs in the internal affairs of the countries, the position of the Middle East countries is far from stable, and any time any unexpected and explosive situation may arise. For example, recently there is internal trouble in the Lebanon. The main opposition group, the National Front, had held the Lebanese governments' acceptance of the Eisenhower Doctrine as a betrayal of the Arab cause. The tension in the Labanon between a pro-west government and the opposition tanxious for a policy of positive neutrality had come to be heightened by President Chamoun's plan to run for a second term of office, for which a constitutional amendment would need to be effected. There has been outbreak of riots in Beirut, Tripoli and other towns, and the Anglo-American and Soviet naval units are standing by watching the situation. The Lebanese Govenment has complained to the U. N. Security council against U. A. R., for intervention in the country's internal affairs. Let us hope that there is no major flare-up and the situation is handled tactfully by the various powers.

8. COLD WAR OR EAST—WEST TENSION.

Soon after the end of world war II, serious differences arose between the two countries— the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union, which emerged as the most powerful countries in the world. Though they were allies during war, and fought side by side against the Germans yet their ideol ogical differences split them apart into two opposite and hostile camps. The Soviet Union has built its political and social system on socialism, or communism, and believes that this system must spread all over the world. The Americans, on the other hand, believe in the capitalistic and democratic system, and can not tolerate the spread of communism. They call the democratic and capitalistic countries as representing the 'free world' and are prepared to resist with all their might any encroachment of communism. The Russians look upon such attempts on the part of the Americans as threats to their own system, and are engaged in a tremendous struggle not merely to consolidate communism in their own country, but also to spread it in other countries of the world and thus gain more and more international support.

Since World War II Communism has made great strides. The whole of China, the biggest country in Asia has become communist. A number of countries of Eastern Europe—Plland, Rumania, Austria, Hungary, Czechosolov-akia,, Bulgaria, Yugooslavia are communist. East Germany is controlled by the Russians. Moreover communism is infiltering in various countries of the middle East, South East Asia, and Far East. The Americans, and their Western allies—England, France, and other small countries of Western Europe,—and Canada, have joined together by means of North Atlantic, Treaty organisation (NATO)

in order to resist the possible Soviet attack. In the middle East, England with the support of the U.S.A. has entered into a military pact, the Baghdad Pact, with Turkey, Iraq, Persia, and Pakistan. In the south East Asia another pact—South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEAT) has been formed by the U.S.A., U.K., the Philippines, Pakistan etc. All these pacts are designed to meet the possible attack of Russia on the 'free world'. On the other hand, Russia has also entered into military pacts with China, as well as with the East European countries (the Warsaw Pact) in order to resist any attack from the Anglo-American bloc. Moreover both Russia and the Western Powers are busy in building up military bases, and equipping themselves with the most advanced types of deadly weapons for the war which they consider impending.

Thus though no actual war is being waged between two blocs, a regular and persistent type of cold war is going on all over the world between the two giants—the U S.A. and the Soviet Union. This is naturally most dangerous, because this constant tension may at any moment reach the breaking point, the cold war may turn into hot war, and the whole world may find itself in the grip of the most devastating catastrophe which may annihilate the whole human race, as both the camps are armed to the teeth with the most deadly weapons.

Referring to the cold war prevalent between the East and the West, and its terrible consequences, Mr. George Kennan said in his famous Reith Lectures, delivered from B. B. C; "There are few, I am sure, who will not agree that never in history have nations been faced with a danger greater than that which now confronts us in the form of the atomic weapon race. Except in instances where there was a possibility of complete genocide, past dangers have generally threatened only the existing generation. To-day it is everything which is at stake—the kindliness of our natural environment, the human experience, the genetic composition of the race, the possibilities of health and

life for future generations—which is at stake.

"Not only is this danger terrible, but it is immediate. Efforts towards composition of major political differences between the Russians and ourselves have been practically abandoned. Belief in the inevitability of war—itself the worst disservice to peace—has grown unchecked. We have a world order marked by extreme instability. In the middle East we have a situation, any disturbance of which could now easily involve us in all out of war. No one on either side wishes this to occur; yet the complete uncertainty as to the adversary's intentions and the premium that rests on the element of surprise in an atomic war could easily cause people to take, under the pressure of fear or misunderstanding actions the effects of which would be irreparable. It is against this terrible, immediate, and almost inconceivable danger that the risks of an effort to negotiate a political settlement with Russia must today be measured.

"To me it is a source of amazement that there are people who still see the escape from this danger in the continued multiplication by use of the destructiveness and speed of delivery of the major atomic weapons. These people seem unable to wean themselves from the belief that if the Russians gain the slighest edge on us in the capacity to wreak massive destruction at long range, they will immediately use it, regardless of our capacity for retaliation, whereas, if we can only contrive to get a tiny bit ahead of the Russians, we shall in some way have won; our salvation will be assured; the road will then be paved for a settlement on our own terms. This cast of thought seems to have been much encouraged, in my own country at least, by the shock of the launching of the Russian earth satellite".

Thus the two power-blocs are in the grip of the war psychosis, mutual fear and suspicion, and there is going on the inexorable armament race, which instead of

ensuring peace and safety, may lead to war. The following facts disclosed by Mr. Khrushchev in his interview with an American press representative in January, 1958, provide an idea of the extent of the war psychosis, and its dangerous consequences.

"It was reported that allegedly, a part of the American bomber force, with hydrogen and atomic bombs, were constantly, in the air, and always ready to strike against the Soviet Union. Reports have it that one-half of the planes are in the air.

"This is very dangerous. Such a situation serves as an illustration of the extent of military psychosis in the U.S.A. when planes with hydrogen bombs take off, that means that many people will be in the air piloting them. There is always the possibility of a mental blackout when the pilot may take the slighest signal as a signal for action and fly to the target that he had been instructed to fly to. Under such conditions a war may start purely by chance, since immediately relatiatory action would be taken.

"Does this not go to show that in such a case a war may start as a result of sheer misunderstanding of a derangement in the normal psychic state of a person, which may happen to anybody. Such a horrible possibility must be excluded. It may be that both sides will be against war and yet war may still start as a result of the military psychosis whipped up in the U.S.A.

"Even if only one plane with one atomic or one hydrogen bomb were in the air in this case too it would not be the government but the pilot who could decide the question of war. And this, as you may imagine, would be a terrible thing".

The East—West tension was showing signs of relaxation, and it was hoped that the two blocs were ultimately

arriving at some sort of reconcilition, when suddenly the cold war was intensified last year by the events following the Anglo-French attack on Egypt and the Soviet intervention in Hungary. Later events demonstrated that the two colossi—USSR and the U.S.A.—were in no mood to reconcile with the other—threatening in the process the independence of small countries.

The game which was played by two giants after the suez crisis and the Hungarian rebellion was purely selfish and solely motivated by power politics. The U.S.A. opposed Anglo-French aggression on Egypt and was on that account hailed throughout the world. It was expected that she would help the emergence of some sort of stability in that highly unstable area of the world. But then came the Eisenhower Doctrine of filling up the power vacuum in the Middle East created by Anglo-French withdrawal from the area. This new move of the U S.A. intensified the mutual difference of the Middle Eastern countries and brought upon them a new pressure from the Soviet Union who could not reasonably be expected to view with indifference the reinforcement of American military strength near her borders.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union, which had shown some welcome changes of its policy during early 1956, indicated of late—particularly after the Hungarian uprising—that she was also in no mood to lessen her grip on the satellites in Eastern Europe. In fact it it appears that the grip is being tightened up. The suppression of the Hungarian uprising continues to be glorified as an act of great international help to the people of Hungary.

Simultaneously with such military and political tightening up of the Communist camp there was a determined effort to close up ranks ideologically. After her exposure during the Hungarian crises the Soviet Union apparently felt so uncertain of her position that the task

of providing a theoretical justification of Soviet Russian Stand fell on the Chinse Communist Party which, in a long statement virtually endorsed every step of the Soviet Government. The Chinese Communist Party soundly condemned Marshal Tito and other Communist intellectuals who had criticised Soviet atrocities in Hungary.

The position now is that the two power groups stand further apart and the nations favouring non-involvement in power-bloc rivalries find themselves in increasingly greater danger. All sorts of accusations and counter—accusations are being made on both sides each side charging the other with aggressive intentions while posing itself as absolutely innocent and working whole-heartedly for peace. In his State in the Union Message to the joint session of the American Congress on January 9, 1958, President Eisenhower said :

"The threat to our safety, and to the hope of a peaceful world, can be simply stated. This threat is not something imagined by the critics of the Soviets. Soviet spokesmen, from the beginning, have publicly and frequently declared their aim to expand their power, one way or another, throughout the world.

"This threat has become increasingly serious as this expansionist aim has been reinforced by an advancing industrial, military and scientific establishment. But what makes the Soviet threat unique in history is its all-inclusiveness. Every human activity is pressed into service as a weapon of expansion, trade, economic development, military power, arts, science, education, the whole world of ideas—all are harnessed to this same chariot of expansion. The Soviets are in short, waging cold war. The only answer to a regime that wages cold war is to wage total peace".

On the other hand, Mr. Bulganin in his letter to Mr. Nehru appealing to the latter to use his good offices to ease

East-West tension, accused the Western Powers of aggressive designs against Russia :

"You know a session of the Council of the North Atlantic bloc will open in Paris on December 16, 1957. Distinct from the usual practice, it will be attended by heads of Governments of the N.A.T.O. countries. N.A.T.O leaders do not conceal that this session is to discuss ways and means of intensifying the arms race and to elaborate new strategic plans providing for the equipment of the forces of the N.A.T.O. counrties with nuclear and rocket weapons.

"The so-called 'doctrine of interdependence' of the N.A.T.O. countries, worked out at the Washington meeting of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan, indicates that further pressure is to be exerted on members of the North Atlantic Pact and other aggressive blocs in order to make a more extensive use of their resources and further cut their independence in matters of foreign policy with a view to the preparation of war.

"Even such outstanding acheivements of scientific and technical thought as the launching of artifical earth satellites are being used for inflaming military passions.

" You will have noticed that these plans are being worked out in an artificially built—up atomsphere of war hysteria and intimidation of the public by a mythical threat of attack on the part of the Soviet Union.

" Yet it is well known that the U.S.S.R. insisted and continues to insist that ballistic missiles and the hydrogen and atom bombs, capable of spreading death and destruction over vast areas, should never be used for purposes of destruction, that the great achievement of human thought be used entirely for the peaceful advadcement of society.'

" The Governments of the U.S.A. and other Western Powers are well aware that the Soviet Union does not attend to attack either tne U.S.A. or any other country. On the contrary, it would like to have good relations with all countries, including, naturally, the U.S.A.

"Certain circles distort the peaceful aims of the Soviet Union's Foreign policy in order to whitewash somehow their aggressive foreign policy and justify their constantly growing military expenditures.

" All the experiences of recent years convincingly show that the activity of members of the North Atlantic bloc in the Disarmament Commission and its sub-committee has been directed precisely towards these ends. Having a majority in the Disarmament Commission, the Western Powers in fact wrecked the cause of disarmament and used this body as a screen for intensification of the arms race, including nuclear weapons of mass annihilation.

" In our times it is not only moral and ethical considerations but also practical commonsense that urge mankind to take the only road-the road of peaceful co-existence. So that mankind could live in peace, one must recounce the policy which is insane in our times of settling disputed issues through force or threat of force".

For some months efforts are being made by Russia as well as the U.S.A. and other Western powers to ease the tension, and hold the Summit Conference. In order to pave the way for the Foreign Minister's Conference, which would ultimately lead to the Summit meeting between the heads of the States, the envoys of the U.S.A., Britain and France met the Russian Foreign Ministers, Mr. Gromyko in Moskow in April, 1958. Recently Mr. Khurschev. in his speech in the Russian parliament challenged the West to sign a no-war agreement with Russia, and decide the future "on a basis of which each of our two

systems gives its people the best lives". He further said. "We have proposed a meeting of the Heads of Governments of Capitalist and Communist States that will solve all problems that trouble humanity, including disarmament.

"We tell the United States to abandon its policy of position of strength. Let us solve our problems by peaceful means on a basis of equality. Let us outlaw war. Let us recognise the status quo-that is, the situation existing in the world to-day with the existence of socialist and capitalist systems. Let us not interfere in each other's affairs. We must decide our problems, not by war but by peaceful means, the future to be decided not by war or rockets or hydrogen bombs, but on a basis on which each of the two systems gives its people the best life". Mr. Khruschev gave this two point formula for reaching on agreement.

"First, we must abstain from discussing problems concerning ideological difference between our two systems. We must leave the solution of these problems to the people themselves.

"Secondly, we must recognise the Soviet system the highest form of society for the good of the individual".

Preparations are afoot for the Summit talks. Let us hope that at last the two blocs will ultimately come to an agreement and put an end to cold war. There are two visions before the world-one of peace, prosperity and good will, and the other of war, destruction and conflict. Let us hope that it will choose the former. Referring to the crucial choice which the modern world has to make between the two extreme, Lord Bertrand Russel has stated in his recent article on international situation - The Two Visions

"We have it in our power, through the resources of science, which are now in large part so sadly misused, to

create a world far better and far happier than any which has existed in the past. Poverty could be abolised, the dread of disaster, which now paralyses thoughtful men, could be ended, and creative abilities could be freed, for human acheivement and not for destruction. Before very long, war could come to be viewed as we now view cannibalism, which once was equally universal. In moments of hopeful vision, I see men throwing off the shackles of ancient fears and hates and welcoming the recognition that the welfare of each is the welfare of all and that the old hostilities and rivalries are an outworn folly.

"And then, I see another picture, perhaps, in the quite near future, a sudden end to human life, or, if that is for the moment averted, fanatical groups of men taught by their Governments and their leaders of thought to view rival groups as wicked. I see science, which in itself is one of the most splendid of human acheivements, perverted to become the minister of death, and the education of the young advocated with a view to increasing their skill as assassins. I see more and more of human effort put into a futile competition in death dealing engines until the pepultions are reduced to bare subsistence level. And, in the end, howling hordes of fanatics exterminating each other and all bystanders in a vast orgy of murder,

"Which of these visions will the world choose ?.

---

9. THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION

The United Nations Organisation was founded on the 26th of June, 1945, at San Francisco in U.S.A., and as the opening sentence of the Charter points out, its principal aims are mainly to save succeeding generations from the scourage of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, to promote social progress, to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another. It

is based on the Atlantic Charter signed by president Rossevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1940 on the high seas five years before Japan signed the Armistic and the United Nations Declarations signed on January 1, 1942 by 26 nations which incidentally formed the wartime coalition against the Axis powers and which incidentally formed the nucleus of the new world organisation by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union when they met in a conference at Moscow from October 19 to October 30, 1943. In the communique which was released by them on November 1, 1943, they declared "They recognise the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organisation, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership, by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security". The communique of the Teheran Conference which was attended by the big three statesmen of the world-Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin issued on December, 1, 1943, also declared "We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations. large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, opposition and intolerance. We will welcome them, as they may choose to come, into a world family of Democractic Nations". But the details of the machinery and workings of the new world organisation were thrashed out and completed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in October, 1944 and its Charter was finally signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945.

The United Nations Organisation started with a membership of 50 States from all the five continents, including U.K., U.S.A , U.S.S.R. France, China and India and subsequently there were five additions, viz., Poland, Sweden, Iceland, Afghanistan and Siam. At present there are 79 States as its members. The functions of the U.N.O. are carried out with a number of organisations of which the important are :—

1. The General Assembly consisting of one member from each member State, which is the deliberation body of the U.N.O. with a Chairman and seven Vice-Chairman.

2. The Security Council with 11 members (of which five viz U.K., U.S.A., U.S.S.R. France, and China are permament members and six others are elected for two years by the other member States) which is the executive body of the U.N.O. and which has powers almost independent of the Assembly.

3. The Economic and Social with 18 members, incharge of some important Departments.

4. Trusteeship Council in charge of the nonself-governmenting territories.

5. The Court of International Justice at The Hague with 15 Judges to decide disputes between member nations.

6. The Secretariat with its obvious functions, and lastly,

7. The Military Staff Committee in order to organise the military forces of the U.N.O. Amongst the subsidiary organs are :

(*a*) The U.N.R.A.A. (The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration).

(*b*) The U.N.F.A.O. (The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation).

(*c*) The U.N.E.S.C.O. (The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation).

(*d*) The I.L.O. (The International Labour Organisation).

(*e*) The W.H.O. (The world Health Organisation).

(*f*) The Disarmament Commission.

There are also the Atomic Energy Commission, the Human Rights Commission and other Economic and Social Commissions which are set up from time to time.

There is a popular belief that the U.N.O is a new edition of the league of Nations which was started after the first World War, and that it is no better than the League, and as such it must meet the fate of that organisation. But a comparative examination of the two organisation reveals the predecessor both in respect of its organisation and functions. The germ of the League of Nations is found in the Fourteen points of president Wilson, which he enunciated during the course of the first World War. The fourteenth point ran thus : "A general association of nations must be formed under specific convenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantee of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike". But these high-sounding ideals were discarded by the peace-makers and the new world organisation was tied to the peace settlement of 1919, which proved unfortunate in many ways. The U.N.O. on the other hand, is based on the practical realism of world statesmen. The League of Nations had as its aim the promotion of international peace and security. But the purpose of the establishment of the U.N.O. are set forth in Article 1 of the United Nations Charter. They are, "to maintain international peace and security", to develop friendly relations amongst nations, based on the principles of equality and self-determination of peoples, to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of economic, social cultural or humanitari a nature and to harmonise the actions of nations in the attainment of these objects". The Economic and Social Council of the U.N.O. has been created with a view to promoting the economic and social betterment of the people residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the various member States. It was realised at the time of the formation of

the U.N.O. that the establishment of international peace and security cannot be achieved without removing economic and social causes. Thus the U.N.O. has gone step further than the League of Nations. It aims at preparing a more solid ground on which the new structure of world government is based. Furthermore, the UNESCO which is an amplified and improved form of the Committee on the Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, aims at creating psychological basis for world peace. It aims at building a defence against devastating wars in the minds of men Another great difference between the League of Nations and U.N.O. is that former started with some handicaps. The very country whose president had taken the initiative for the formation of the League did not join it. Other Impontant countries outside the League were Germany which joined in 1926 and the U.S. S.R. which joined in 1934. But all the sponsors of the idea of the U.NO. are its members and it is fortunate in keeping within its fold the leaders of the two power blocs the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

Though the U. N. O is not a perfect organisation for preserving world peace and bringing about the economic and social regeneration of the world yet it has, not doubt, certain achievements to its credit. In the twentieth century large nations have not attacked strong powers. They have got into war through third parties or by taking sides in smaller conflicts. And in the two world wars, the aggressors plainly miscalculated. They never would have taken the first step if they had known what a combination of resistance they would finally encounter. The time to seize upon the tinder-box situations, is in the early stages. If world opinion insists upon nations bringing their disputes to the Security Council instead of using force, or the threat of force, to settle them, the chances are very good that they will do so. In practice, they have always done so since the United Nations was formed. In the short history of the United Nations it has dealt with a

number of cases, and in each of them it has promoted peaceful settlements and prevented or reduced conflict. The cases of Iran, Syria, and Lebanon, Greece, Kashmir, Palestine, Indonesia, all make points for contention. At the very least the fighting has been confined and held under control, and the way to peaceful settlement charted. Under the spotlight of the United Nations, the members are careful not to get caught in the role of the aggressor. Or, to put it positively, nations compete for sympathetic world opinion by following the Charter and using its facilities for specific seltlement in place of force.

In the United Nations the countries on both sides of the iron curtain do meet. There is disagreement-often violent but there is also accountability. Every government has to ask itself when it is considering a policy or an action in international relations. "How will it look to others if the matter is brought into question in the General Assembly or the Security Council or the Trusteeship Council? Each one has to weigh its contemplated action against the possible international reaction which might be expected in the United Nations. So the number of peace-disturbing acts that are not finally committed must be very numerous. Moreover, in spite of the dramatic episodes of disagreement in the Security Council, there is co-operation in the United Nations that is broader, and takes in more objectives, than during any previous period of history. There is prestigue and moral power in the very large majorities by which the General Assembly determines major recommendations.

The chief criticism levelled against the U. N. O. is the relatively excessive influence exercised by the Big Powers in the counsels of the U. N. O., and the provision of the Charter that any one of the Big Five may, by its power of veto, nullify in some cases the resolution of the U. N. O. It is by the exercise of this veto that the U. S.A. is preventing the admission of Red China into the

U. N. O. Another criticism is that the military staff Committee has not even begun to organise the armed forces of the U. N. O. and the Atomic Energy Committee has not made much headway.

Recently another development has taken place in world politics, which has considerably undermined the prestigue of the U.N.O. There is a growing tendency among world politicians to bypass the U N.O. in some very important matters. The U.N.O. was bypassed for the first time in the Geneva Conference on Indo-China, and then subsequently by the Four-Power 'Summit' Conference of Heads of States to discuss issue with which the U.N.O. had been wrestling for long without any great progress. That the Indo-China settlement worked out at Geneva was desirable and welcome cannot alter the fact that the latter-day tendency to bypass the U. N. O. must inflict a grave blow to its prestigue and authority. Another nail has been recently driven into the coffin of the U.N.O. by Britain, France and the United States in calling a conference in London to discuss the Suez dispute without even a reference to the U.N.O. The reasons for this step are obvious. With the veto operating in the Security Council Britain's scheme of cowing down Egypt by force or the threat of force would stand to be ruled out by Russia if the dispute were to be taken there.

But it would be uncharitable to think that U. N. O. has not played any effective role in world affairs. That eleven years of unpreacedented stress and strain failed to produce a third world war is in itself a tribute to the effective existence of the United Nations, although no doubt the atomic piles have had their own share in this happy outcome. There is no cause for despair because the U.N.O. is a real attempt at establishing a real parliament of men. It is really one of the most important and epoch-making institutions in the history of the world—one with which the highest and noblest aspirations of civilisation are associ-

ated, in fact the future hope of mankind, its anchor of possible safety is an uneasy tempestuous world. Whatever the temporary difference between Russia and U.S.A., or U. K. may be, all are now thoroughly convinced that a Third World War would mean the destruction not only of civilisation, but of mankind as we know it.

"If the United Nations is unable to achieve its objectives, it is because nations who have subscribed to the Charter are unwilling, unready, or unable to carry out their obligations. They are still obsessed by their national interests and security by military power. Instead of using the United Nations as an instrument for mediation and peace-makings, we use it for the implementation of cold war strategy. When aggression takes place, in some cases collective action is encouraged, and in others it is discouraged. Military assistance through pacts to some countries is accepted as reasonable while even sale of arms to others is deplored as unreasonable. It is unfortunate that strategic considerations supercede adherence to principles. This weakens the moral authority of the United Nations. Again, the United Nations loses much of its value because many countries who should be its members are refused admission. Millions of men still under colonial rule are not represented in it. The universality of the United Nations is imparied by discriminant treatment. Policies of race discrimination, colonial dominations are practised by many countries and though they are gross violations of human rights, the United Nations is unable to enforce the provisions of the Charter. The trouble in the United Nations Assembly today about the Kashmir issue is one evidence of it. All this is possible because powerful nations of the West set the course of debate and influence decisions. The largest Asian nation (China) has no place in it.

"In human history it is often the day of great tribulation and deep despair that are the prelude to a time of enlightenment. The scale of our distress is sufficient to prompt the question whether we have not, on the presump-

tion of nationalism and pride of material achievements brought the world towards the verge of annihilation. We have followed false roads in blind confidence.

"That the world needs today is not political or military unification but re-education. The individual should be trained to think in terms of humanity, as a whole instead of in terms of this or that particular clan or country. Modern means of communication have widened their cultural and inter-racial contacts and sympathies. The time when different races and nations lived in comparative isolation under their own distinctive laws and institutions is over. We have to adjust ourselves to the new world. The differences are not to be fought out of existence.

"The United Nations, in spite of all its defects, represents a unique and valuable contribution to the cause of peace. It is a bridge between the two groups into which the world is divided. It is a platform for the debate of issues which divide men and a callying point for co-operation concerning issues on which there is unity. It is an agency dedicated to the purpose of developing mutual understanding. It should be our endeavour to make it approximate to a world organisation with faith in democratic and social progress.

---

10 RE-AWAKENING IN ASIA

Asia has a very long history behind it and for long ages it has played an outstanding part in the world. But during the last two or three hundred years, some Eruopean nations developed an industrial civilisation and thus became different in many ways from the East which was still primarily agricultural. The new strengh that colonial advance gave them added to their wealth and power and

an era of colonialism and imperialism began during which the greater part of Asia came under the domination of some countries of Europe. In the long perspective of history it was a brief period, and imperialism which was at its height during the last century and a half has largely faded away. Asia has thus emerged out of its cononial status, and great Asian nations have arisen with long memories of the past they have lived through and with their eyes fixd on a future of promise. Pakistan, India, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia have acquired their freedom. China has taken a new shape and form by becoming communist.

The slumbering levithan of Asia has arisen. Its as yet cramped limbs are moving, and this hitherto inert mass on the march, throwing its weight about, here, there and everywhere, is making its prosence felt in all sorts and conditions of places. Asia has come into her own, and whether one likes to admit it or not, the peoples of Asia are making their distinctive contribution to world politics in the process annexing unto themselves fresh laurels in the domain of human relationships and civilisation.

Asia had always been the original reservior of human civilisation. In the early days of human history, culture was synonymous with religion, and all the principal world religions were Asian in origin and character. Hinduism, Budduhism, Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity and Islam were, and are still, the products of Asia, and breathe an Asian spirit. Even Judaism is Asian in origin and texture. The world's most ancient civilisations—Egyptian, Chaldean, Aryan, Chinese—rose out of the shambles of human endeavour, located and nurtured on the soil of Asia. The first concepts of God and Godhead were the profound fumblings of the multifaced Asian mind, and even in their current manifestations they reflect the indestructible traces and impress of Asian genius, though if Christ were born today he would find himself a prohibited immigrant in the muchvaunted Christian State of South

Africa, because of his Asian birth. World literature traces its origin to the perennial springs of Asian intellect. Astronomy, mathematics and history are the first products of the Asian mind. The first written word, which symbolises the translation of human articulations into recognisable and to be recognised symbols, is to be traced in Asia. The first glimpses of human architecture and art—Mohenj' Daro, the Pyramids, Angkor Vat, Borobodur, the Great Wall of China, the Taj Mahal,—are Asian in conceptiont, and even before the first glimmerings of 'Western Civilisation' Asia had already experienced the rise and fall of the great civilisations. Asia was thus the leader of the world for some four recorded millennia of world history, but it suffered eclipse during the last two or three hundred years, and now out of the decayed entrails of her culture, civilisation and achievement, it is re-emerging as the leader of the world.

Asia, the mother of continents and the cradle of history's major civilisations, is renascent today. The dawn of its newly acquired freedom is turbulent because during the past two centuries its growth was arrested, frustration was widespread and new forces appeared. These forces were essentially nationalist, seeking political freedom, but behind them was the vital urge for bettering the economic condition of the masses of the people. Where nationalism was thwarted there was conflict, as there is conflict today where it is thwarted, for example, in South East Asia. To regard the present unsettled state of South East Asia as a result or as a part of an ideological conflict would be a dangerous error. The troubles and discontents of this part of the world and indeed of the greater part of Asia are the result of obstructed freedom and dire poverty.

Asia is passing through a critical period in its history. It is in ferment, and going through a process of tremendous change, and thus it has become at present the focal point of world tension. There are in it a large number of backward countries in need of urgent economic develop-

ment and others in which acute scaracity of vital commodities prevails. Some parts of Asia are quiet and relatively peaceful whereas others are torn by external troubles and disturbances. The Asian people who have been kept down by imperialistic forces, are now trying to catch up with others who are ahead of them. They have been engrossed in things of the past and time has passed them by. They have not been able to keep pace with it, and so they must now run. They cannot afford to walk but then when they stumble and fall and try to get up again. They realise that speed, especially in an age old continent like Asia, involves risk and dangers but they have no choice in the matter.

Asia is a huge continent, and the peoples of Asia are all different from one another, as they are reared in different cultures and climes. But in spite of all this, there exists among the countries of Asian sentiment and a feeling of unity. Asian countries are so diverse in several respects from one another that one has genuine doubts whether it is possible to speak of one task for Asia. For instance politically Siam was never a colony, but remains an independent kingdom amidst so many colonies. China has since long achieved her freedom. So have the Philippines, Burma and Indonesia although are different in their outlook. |Pakistan, India, and Ceylon, though all members of commonwealth and independent and sovereign are in different stages of political development. Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos are still in a process of rapid development. The Malayan States have progressed in the same direction. Yet, in spite of this apparent diversity there is so much in common, materially and spiritualy among them, that it is natural to speak of Asia as one indivisible whole.

Most of the coloured races of Asia, for instance, have suffered from foreign domination, they still remember the hard life they had as something in common, a common lot. They are all poor pepole, living amidst rich resources

developed by them for the benefit of the foreigners. They are a backward people, illiterate, with an extremely low standard of living, industrially undeveloped or at least under-developed. The immediate task of the governments of these vast countries is, therfore, the raising of the standard of living, as they have now the means in their hands, their destiny is in their hands too. The main, common problem, before the countries of Asia is that of reconstruction, and to solve it they must work in a spirit of cooperation. Putting aside the confines of narrow nationalism, the Asian countries can, with self-confidence and solidarity among themselves, solve many problems that confront them, efficiently and effectively. An immediate pooling of the resources of available means of transport and communication, the adoption of a common price policy for staple products and a mutual exchange of the fruits of research work are some of the points that can be inculuded in the preliminary programme for cooperation in the economic and defence spheres.

There is also the problem of reconstruction in the spiritual field. In all the colonies, the ruler nations have deliberately fostered an inferiority complex among the people with the consequence that the people look down upon their own culture and even customs. A cultural renaissance is, therefore, essential for the spiritual uplift of the people.

The second world war brought in its wake the collapse of European Colonialism in Asia. The newly free Asian nations began to play more important part in world politics. The only danger to these newly born Asiatic States comes from Communist Russia. These nations are fast becoming industrialized and will soon be a bulwork against militant Communism. The world is now split between two powerful blocs, Russian and American. These new Asian powers will soon form a third bloc and be bulwark aganst either of the two blocs starting a war. Lord Burtrard Russel welcome the formation of such

independent states as belong to nither of the two blocs. Asia, according to him, is very important because it contains not only half of the population of the world but also because it is the home of three distinct civilizations, Islamic, Hindus and Chinese.

11. THE ASIAN AFRICAN CONFERENCE

The Asian-African Conference; convened upon the invitation of the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan, met in Bandung (Indonesia) from 18th to 24th April, 1955. In addition to the sponsoring countries 24 more countries—Afghanistan, Cambodia, Peoples Republic of China, Egypt, Ehoiopia, Gold Coast, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya Nepal the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Democratic Republic of Viet-Name, State of Viet Name, Yeman—participated in the Conference.

The convening of the Asian-African had an important historical significance. It was an important signpost of history. It was the logical sequel to the Asian-Relations Conference, the Conference on Indonesia (sometimes called the Second Asian-Relations Conference), the Colom bo plan meetings, the Asian Socialist Conference, and the parleys of the 'Colombo powers'. The end of Wes tern dominance in Asia has almost been accomplished. Present day Asia has definitely come of political age, and although the Western nations may attempt to increase or retain influence among the newly independent Asian countries, no responsible individual thinks that Western imperium should be re-established. In the wake of the Independence of As ian countries, some African countries are also emerging as i ndependent units, and their participa ion in the Asian African Conference was a clear proof of the fact that the days of imperialism in Africa also are numbered.

Thus the Conference was held by the Asian and African countries which ardently hope to control their own destines, without the participation of the West. It reflected the common desires and demands of the Asian and African peoples (about a billion and half) who make up more than one half of the world's total population. In the past few centuries the overwhelming majority of the countries and peoples in Asia and Africa have suffered, and still are suffering from the disasters and pains brought about by colonialism. Today there are not a few Asian and African peoples who still live the life of colonial slaves, and who still suffer from the presecution of racial discrimination. Moreover, for all those African and Asian countries which have already attained independence there is still the need for protracted efforts to overcome the econemic and cultural backwardness resulting from colonial rulo. The Asian and African peoples have also suffered from the miseries of war and many Asian and African countries are now the first victims of the new war preparations by the Colonialists. In order to uproot these evils of Colonialism carry out their economic re-construction and raise the standard of living their own peoples, the peoples of the Asian and African countries have urgent need for a peaceful international environment, and they realise more and more the necessity for mutual support and assistance. Therefore opposition to Colonislism and striving for and safeguarding national independence, opposition to aggressive war and upholding world peace, and the promotion of friendly cooperation of the Asian and African on these bases, from the common desires and demands of the peoples of these countries. There is no denying the fact that there are great differences in the social systems among the Asian and African countries, nevertheless, the existence of such differences can never nega'e the common experience and situation of these countries, their common desires and demands, nor can it preclude the possibility that on these common bases these countries can have mutual understanding, sympathy and support.

The Asian-African Conference was thus convened for the purpose of promoting good will and cooperation among the Asian and African countries, exploring and advancing their mutual and common interests and establishing and promoting friendly and neighbourly relations among them. It was agreed by the participating delegates of different countries that the Asian-African Conference should positively affirm and express the desires and demands common to the countries and peoples in Asia and Africa, and should not fall into disputes about social systems and ideologies. Therefore, they adopted the attitude of striving for unity and avoiding quarrels and seeking common ground instead of stressing divergencies. Thus, the participating countries to the Asian-African Conference eventually reached unanimous agreement on the various questions on the agenda, and it issued a final noteworthy communique, upon which a remarkable consensus of agreement was attached.

In the field of economic cooperation among the countries of Africa and Asia, the Asian African Conference, recognised the urgency of promoting economic development in Asian-African region. Tnere was a general desire of economic cooperation among the participating countries on the basis of mutual interest and respect for national sovereignty. They agreed to provide technical assistance to one another to the miximum extent practicable, in the form of experts, trainees, pilot projects and equipment for demonstr tion purpose, the exchange of know-how and establishment of national, and where possible, regional training and research institutes to impart technical knowledge and skills in cooperation with the existiag international agencies. The Asian-African Conference also recommended early establishment of a special United Nations Fund for Economic Development ; the allocation by the International Bank for Reconstruction and development of a greater part of its resources to Asian-African countries, early establishment of an International Finance Corporation which should include in its activities the undertaking of equity investment ; and encouragement of the promotion

of joint ventures among Asian-African countries in so far as this would promote their common interests.

The resolutions of the Asian-African Conference on cultural cooperation condemned colonialism and socialism for their suppression of the Asian and African people and obstruction of cultural intercourse between the Asian and African countries. It affirmed the common desire of the Asian and the African peoples to renew old cultural contacts and develop new cultural exchanges between their countries. True to their age-old traditions of tolerance and universality, the Conference believd that Asian-African cultural cooperation should be developed in the larger context of world cooperation. The conference also felt that promotion of cultural co-operation among their countries should be towards the acquisition of knowledge of one another's country, mutual cultural exchange and the exchange of information.

Opposition to colonialism and striving for the safeguarding of national independence was a basic question before the Conference. It discussed the problems of dependent peoples and colonialism and the evils arising from the subjugation, domination and exploitation. In view of the unsettled situation in North Africa and the persisting denial to the peoples of North Africa of their rights to self determination, the Conference declared its support of the rights of the people of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia to self-determination and independence and urged the French Government to bring about peaceful settlement of the issue without delay.

In the resolution on Human Rights and Self-Determination, the Asian-African Conference declared its support of the fundamental principles of human rights and the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations as set forth in the United Nations Charter. It extended its warm sympathy and support to the courageous stand taken by the victims of racial discrimination, especially by the peoples of African, Indian and Pakistani origin in South

Africa ; applauded all those who sustained their cause, re-affirmed the determination of Asian-African peoples to eradicate every trace of racialism tha. might exist in their own countires ; and pledged itself to use its full moral influence to guard against the danger of falling victime to the same evil in their struggle to eradicate it.

The Asin-African-Conference, taking note of the fact that several States have still not been admitted to the United Nations, considered that for effective co-operation for world peace, membership of the U.N.O. should be universal, and called on the Security Council to support the admissions of all these States which were qualified for membership under the terms of the Charter. The Conference also considered that the representation of the countries of the Asian-African region on the Security Council, in relation to the principle of equitable geographical distribution, was inadequate. It expressed the view that, as regards the distribution of nonpermanent seats, the Asian and African countries which were precluded from being elected, should be able to serve on the Security Council so that they might make a contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Conference, having considered the dangerous situation of international tension existing and the risks confronting the whole human race from an outbreak of global war in which the destructive power of all types of armaments, including nuclear and thermo nuclear weapens, would be employed, invited the attention of all nations to the terrible consequences that would follow if such a war were to break out. It also considered that disarmament and the prohibition of the production, experimentation and the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclar weapons of war were imperative to save mankind and civilisation from the fear and prospect of wholesale destruction. It considered that the nations of Asia and Africa assembled there had a duty towards humanity and civilization to proclaim their support for disarmament and for the prohibition to

these weapons, and to appeal to the nations principally concerned and to world opinion to bring about such disarmament and prohibition.

The Asian-African Conference gave anxious thought to the question of world peace and cooperation. It viewed with deep concern the present state of international tension with the danger of an atomic world war. The declaration on the promotion of world peace and co-operation adopted by the Conference used in its declaration the phraseology "live together in peace" used in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations. The declaration set forth ten principles as the basis for living together in peace and friendly cooperation between the counties concerned.

1. Respect for fundamental human rights for the purposes and principles as set down in the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.

3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small.

4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself, singly or collectivelly, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

6. (*a*) Abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defence to serve the particular interest of any of the Big powers

(*b*) Abstention of any country from exerting

pressure on other countries.

7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territotial integrity or political independence of any country.

8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, such as negotiations, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means of parties' own choice, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

9. Promotions of mutual interests and cooperotion.

10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

The Conference declared its conviction that friendly operation in accordance with these principles would ectively countribute to the maintenance and promotion international peace and security, while cooperation in economic, social and cultural fields would help bring out common prosperity and well-doing,

The Asian-African Conference provided the parti-ating countries with a rare chance of mutual contact. is was a conference without participation of any West- Colonial powers, and the Asian and African countries ld contact one another freely. Such face to face con-ts have promoted mutual understanding and respect ween the Asian and African countries and played no ll parts in the friendly cooperation between them and he cause of safeguarding world peace.

The result of the Asian - African Conference is tively helpful to the relaxation of international ion and safeguarding of world peace. The Con-nce made important achievements. Its resolutions

were imbued with the common desire of the peoples of Asia and Africa to strive for and uphold independence and freedom, safeguard world peace and promote friendly cooperaiion. It strengthened the national consciousness of the Asian and African peoples, advanced mutual understanding between the eastern nations and opened up a new road to international cooperation. From now onward friendly cooperation among the governments and peoples of Asia and Africa will increasingly become a factor playing an important role in international affairs.

The Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference was held at Cairo from 26th December, 1957 to 2nd January, 1958. In this Conference four hundred delegates from 42 Afro-Asian nations and colonies met with the object of outlinging measure for the political and social emancipation of the countries in this region. The Conference was not at government level as at Bandung though several of the delegations were there with the official backing. Delegations made it clear that their members were attending the Conference in their personal capacity and, therefore, the Conference had no political complexion.

The Conference called for the restoration of China's legal and rightful place in the U. N. and said that, no important international problems, specially those of the Far East, can reasonably be settled without active participation of the people of the Republic of China.

The plenary session approved the economic commission recommendation that " the conference had no objection to investment of foreign capital nor does it object to obtaining foreign loans provided such foreign capital investment and loans were not subject to political conditions and were of such a nature as to restrict or to direct economy of the recipient country nor should it have any special privilege over the national capital".

The Conference unanimously condemned South Africa's racial policy and adopted measures to counter it. It agreed to set up a permanent organisation to implement the resolutions and to promote further Afro-Asian solidarity. The new body would have a council convened annually, on which would sit one representative from each Afro-Asian country, and also a permanent secretariat consisting of a secretary-general and 10 secretaries. The Secretary-general would be nominated by the Egyptian solidarity group with headquarters at Cairo. The ten secretaries would be nominated by the groups of Japan, Indian, Cammeroons, China, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Sudan, Syria and Russia.

---

12. INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL PACTS

After World War II there is a growing tendency among the nations of the world to enter into regional pacts for economic, political or defensive cooperation. This tendency is specially noticeable among the Western democracties who are terribly afraid of Russian aggression and are very anxious to stem the tied of Communism. Being conscious of the over-whelming strength of Russian armed forces, which would certainly prove too much for any single nation to resist, these Western nations have entered into military pacts in order to offer collective resistance. They believe that in doing so, they will not only ensure safety in time of war, but also to a large extent, prevent the Russian from launching any aggressive campaign. Moreover, fearing further infiltration of Communism in Asia, after China, has gone red, these Western nations have entered into military pacts with them, thus building up a large ring

over the globe with a view to encircling Russia and China. This ring begins with the North Atlantic Pacts and ends with the South East Asian Pact. In between, more or less are the Balkan Pact, the Turko Pakistan Pact and the Angus Pact. At the further end there is Japan. a former enemy, just as at the starting point there is Germany. Some of the links in the chain are still weak and there are many missing links—notably in South and South east Asia, Egypt, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia and in the Middle East and some Arab countries.

The most important and the earliest of these pacts is the North Atlantic Treaty Orgonisation (NATO). Negotiations for this treaty began in Washington in the summer of 1948 among representatives of the governments of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States which resulted in agreement on the specific terms of a treaty providing for a collective security arrangement among nations of the North Attlantic area. The Treaty was signed by these countries and also by Norway, Ice-land, Italy and Portgual in the first week of April, 1949. Since then three more countries—Greece, Turkey, and West Germany—have signed this treaty thus raising the number of member countries to fifteen.

The most important articles of the Treaty are (1) The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any one of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened. (2) The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North American shall be considered an attack against them all, and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each one of them, in exercise of the right of individul or collective self-defence recognisad by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith individually hand in con-

cert with other Parties, such action as it deems necessary including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of North Atlantic area".

The nations who are parties to the NATO profess that this treaty is meant mainly to preserve peace, and prevent aggression. They believe that on account of the obstructive policy of Russia the United Nations Organisation sometimes fails to achieve its object of preserving international peace, and, therefore, the Atlantic Pact is essential for counteracting any aggressive design on that part of Russia, which cannot be properly dealt with by the Security Council hampered in its work by the Russian veto. They also believe that this pact is designed to fit precisely into the framework of the United Nations and to assure practical measures for maintaining peace and security with the United Nations Charter.

The U. S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, explaining the meaning of the North Atlantic Pact remarked :

"It is clear that the North Atlantic Pact is an improvisation. It is the statement of the facts and lesson of history. We have learned in our history lesson from two world wars in less a century. That experience has taught us that the control of Europe by a single aggressive, unfriendly power could constitute an intolerable threat to the national security of the United States. We participated in these two great wars to preserve the integrity and independence of the European half of the Atlantic Community in order to preserve the 'integrity and independence of the American half. It is a simple pact, proved by experience, that an outside attack on one members of this community is an attack upon all members. We have also learnt that if free nations do not stand together, they will fall one by one. The stratagem of an aggressor is to keep his intended victims, divided, or, better still, set them to quarrelling among themselves. Then they can be picked

off one by one without arousing unified resistance. We and the free nations of Europe are determined that history shall not repeat itself in that melancholy particular". Referring to ths Pact President Truman remarked: "If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance, that any armed attack affecting our national security would be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack might never occur".

The Russian Charge against the North Atlantic Treaty is that it is a step toward undermining the United Nations and the parties to the treaty, participating the United States, have engineered the treaty for imperialist c purposes and with aggressive designs. Replying to this charge in the General Assembly of the U. N. O. in 1949, the U. S. representative Mr. Austin explained the point of view of his country: "The treaty has come into existence because there is a real need for it in the world-today. It is a formal acknowledgement of the repeatedly demonstrated fact that the nations on both sides of the North Atlantic have a natural community of interests and of democratic ideals. The Europeans part of this community is now engaged in the great co-opeative effort to attain economic recovery and the blessings of political and social stability which depends so much on economic well-being. In that effort the United States is assisting on a very large scale because it knows that a sound and healthy Europe is a great force for peace, a vital element in a strong United Nations, and a friendly partner with the United States in the effort for increased security for all. But Western European recovery is being retarded by a sense of insecurity and fear stemming from the increased pressure and threats which have their origin in the plans or fancies of International Communism. Already certain countries have found themselves unable to resist such pressure and have become submerged. It is vital to peace that this process should not be continued. The nations of the North Atlantic area have learned the lesson that they must stand

together and make it plain in advance that they will do so, since preservation of freedom and independence of any of them is incontestably a matter of vital concern to all. The treaty is intended to remove the feeling of insecurity which hinders economic recovery in Europe and to re-establish a needed equilibrium under which East and West can co-operate in the United Nations and outside it, in mutual respect and forbearance. The American people and their governments consider these aims to be wholly consistent with our commitments to render steadfast support to the United Nations.

Thus the bais of the North Atlantic Treaty is the desire on the part of the Western nations to organise themselves against a possible Russian aggresston. They know that individually they cannot resist an attack from Russia, collectively they might. The past is based on the psychology of fear. This fact is clear from the speech of General Gruenther, NATO Supreme Commander, delivered, in September, 1955, in which he said," The Soviet land army, the largest and the most effective in the world, consists of 175 divisions. The Russians have 20,000 operational planes, the vast majority of them jets, and they have more than 350 submdrines. The forces of the Soviet satellite countries include some 2,500, planes and between 75 and 80 divisions totalling between 1 and 1.2 million. Our task is one not of advocating war, not of saying that war is likely, but of basing our plans on the possible chance that they will use the force they have. A Soviet offensive could be successfully met when the German force become effective, and assuming that we can have use of new weapons, this will be in roughly three or four years.

"We must not mistake the shadow for the substance in confusing Soviet smiles with performance. For smiles can change very rapidly as long as the capability of war of the Soviet remains as high. That capability is actually increasing, but democracies want so deserately to believe

the smiles that it is going to be increasingly difficult to maintain our unity, and to continue the sacrifice necessary in this type competition. I do not want to be cynical, but I simply want to bring us back to realities. As of now, they still have an overwhelming military power, and, especially, in the conventional field, they still have a very big edge on us. Also, there is no indication that they have abandoned their long-range objective of world domination. In fact, they have been specific on this v ry subject."

The Big Three Western nations, U. S. A., U. K. and France—have also entered into military pacts with some Asian national with the purpose of strengthening their defence against Russia, and have promised these countries huge economic aid in order to raise the standard of living of their people and thus keep them away from Communism. South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) and the Baghdad Pact are the two important pacts of this type.

In South East Asia Treaty Organisation, France, New-Zealand, Pakistan, the Phillippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom and the United States are the member nations. Besides promoting higher living standards, economic progress and strengthening the fabric of peace and freedom, the main object of SEATO is to "maintain and develop the individual and collective capacity of the member nations to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without".

The Baghdad pact has been signed by Iraq, Pakistan, Persia, Turkey and the United Kingdom, with the full active sympathies of U.S.A. Besides promoting economic co-operation and preserving peace, the main object of this

pact is to organise collective deference against external aggression, for which the U.S.A. has given free aid in the provision of arms and other military equipement.

It is clear that the SEATO and the Baghdad Pact are meant mainly for stemming the advance of Communism to the underdeveloped countries of Asia. Refferring to the Baghdad Pact, Sir Anthony Eden, the British Prime Minister, has thus remarked; "There can be nothing aggressive about the Baghdad Pact. It has not the offensive power to be aggressive, if it wants to be. It can do much to promote common defence and to help in building up the economic life of the countries linked together by it, to raise their standard of living and to give their people hope and confidence. If the peasant and town populations of these countries once taste the fruits of an intelligently organised free economy, they would never look at Communism again".

Besides these pacts, there are the Turco-Iraq Pact for military alliance, to which the United Kingdom has also become a party, and the Turco-Pakistan Pact covering economic and defence matters.

As a counterblast to the Atlantic Pact, Russia and China, the big communist Powers, signed the Sino-Russian Treaty in 1950 for 30 years, providing for mutual help in economic and military matters.

---

13. ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

We live in an age of crises. One crisis follows another, and even when there is some kind of peace, it is a troubled

peace with fear of war and preparation for war. Tortured humanity hungers for real peace, but some evil fate pursues it and pushes it farther away from what it desires most. Almost it seems that some terrible destiny drives humanity to ever-recurring disaster. We are all entangled in the mesh of past history and cannot escape the consequences of past evil.

The only way out of this impasse seems to be one-world Government. World Government must, and will, come for there is no other remedy for the world's sickness. The machinery for it is not difficult to devise. It can be an extension of the federal principle, a growth of idea underlying the United Nations, giving each national unit freedom to fashion its destiny according to its genius, but subject always to the basic covenant of the world government.

It is obvious that if we want to abolish robbery, violence and killing as between nations, we must do the same thing for nations as has been done for individuals, i e., to establish the rule of law over them. Abolition of war required that when two nations have a difference which they cannot settle in a friendly way by agreement, they should be complled to accept an impartial decision—to arbitrate instead of fight, there must be an authority above them all. There must be an International Court of Justice. There must be a force acting under International orders, a policeman to enforce the decisions of that court of justice.

So in order to keep law and order in the world there must be the Court and the policeman. The scales of justice are vain without her sword. To get rid of war we must establish a positive alternative to war as a means of settling disputes between nations which they cannot compose by agreement between themselves, to make certain that this positive alternative of arbitration is adopted in

every case we must have a world authority above all nations as the national State has power over all citizens.

Now such a world authority will certainly mean some abandonment of absolute sovereignty of nations, which it present means that every nation is a law to itself, entitled to trv to get its own way not only at home, but in all its dealings with other nations with its own force, if it can. But a world authority for peace will not mean loss of national self-government or national freedom, it will simply limit, what may be called, the anarchic sovereignty of nations.

Just as the freedom of every individual citizen is increased, not diminished, by the fact that he has to live under law, the same would hold for nations under world government. A citizen may sometimes think that he has too many laws, but without going into the details of particular laws, it is clear that the freedom of the individual to go about his business without fear of his being stabbed in the back or robbed at any moment, depends upon the fact that he lives under the rule of law. In the same manner the nations under world government would have more freedom not less freedom, if war were abolished and replaced by international justice' enforced at need by an authority above all nations, great and small.

The idea of One-world Government has met with great opposition from several quarters. Some of the political thinkers consider it to be an impossibility, a mere illusion. They are of the opinion that virtually all arguments for world government rest upon the simple presupposition that the desirability or world order proves the attainability of world government. Our precarious situation is unfortunately no proof either of the moral ability of mankind to create a world Government by an act of will, or of the political ability of such a government to integrate a world community in advance of a more

gradual gorwth of the 'social tissue' which every community requires more than government.

They further argue that most advocates of world government also assume that nations need merely follow the alleged example of the individuals of another age who are supposed to have achieved community by codifying their agreements into law and by providing an agency of some kind for law enforcement. This assumption they point out, ignores the historic fact that the natural respect for each other's rights in a particular community is older than any code of law, and that machinery for the enforcement of law can be efficacious only when a community as a whole obeys its laws implicitly, so that coercive enforcement may be limited to a recacitrant minority.

According to them the fallacy of world government can be stated into two simple propositions. The first is that governments are not created by fiat though sometimes they can be imposed by tyranny. The second is that governments have only a limited efficacy integrating a community. The advocates of world Government talk of calling a world constitutional order and would then call upon the nations to abrogate or abridge their sovereignty in order that this newly created universal sovereignty could have unchallenged sway. No such explicit abnegation has ever taken place in history. Explicit government authority has developed historically from the implicit authority of patriarchal or matriarchal forms. Governments, so established, have extended their dominion over weaker neighbours. But the abridgment of sovereignty has always been indirect rather than direct or it has been imposed by the superimposition of power.

In spite of these serious objections to the idea of One-World Government, it is worth while planning and working for it, because if it cannot be achieved humanity

is doomed. It may take a long time before this idea is translated into reality, but serious efforts must be made in this direction by all peace-loving citizens of the world. After World War I a move in this direction was made by setting up the League of Nations. That failed and it is easy now to see what if failed. The Covenant of League never even formally prohibited war. Every nation in the last resort kept the right to get its own day. The League never had any force at its command. After World War II a fresh attempt was made by setting up the United Nations. This is also not working well upto the present, the Security Council has great powers but it is made largely important by the Veto on effective action given to each of the five great Powers, thus placing each of them above the law established for other nations.

But in the last resort both failure of the League and the difficulties of the United Nations spring from lack of interest on the part of the ordinary citizens of the world. That is why there is an urgent necessity of starting the crusade for world government. The idea underlying such crusuade should be to moboilise the opinion of ordinary citizens in favour of world govrement and make that effective in bringing about a change in the political structure of the world. Though a world government is still too far distant to be considered as serious possibility, there is no reason why propaganda for world government should not be carried on. The creation of a world government is a desirable political reform; but this political reform will not take place without a reform in human morals.

Peace can reign in the world only when all States are reduced to the position of individual units in a federation of States in which all States enjoy internal autonomy without the authority or the means of aggression, economic, social or political. This is a serious problem which must be faced by any movement seeking to propagate world peace—no matter by what means they intend to introduce it. In a

no properly representative and equitable world federation nations, much can be achieved, and this machinery ought to be planned and installed as soon as possible.

H. G. Wells, who was a staunch supporter of One-World Government, and who considered it as the next stage in history, discussing the advantages that would accure to mankind by such a move, has rightly observed in his famous outline of History, "There can be little question that the attainment of a federation of all humanity, together with a sufficient measure of social justice, ensure health, education and rough equality of opportunity to most of the children born into the world, would mean such a release and increase of human energy as to open a new phase in human history. The enormous was caused by military preparations and the mutual annoyance of competing great Powers and the still more enormous waste due to the under-productiveness of great masses of people, either because they are too wealthy for stimulus or too poor for efficiency, would cease There would be a vast increase in the supply of human necessities, a rise in the standard of life and is what is considered a necessity, a development of transport and every kind of convenience, and a multitude of people would be transferred from low-grade production to such higher work, as art of all kinds, teaching scientific research, and the like. All over the world there would be setting free of human capacity such as has occurred hither only in small places and through precious limited phases of prosperity and security.

"To picture to ourselves something of the wider life that world unity would open to men is a very attractive speculation. Life will certainly go with a stronger pulse, it will breathe a deeper breath, because it will have dispelled and conquered a hundred infections of body and mind and now reduce it to invalidism and squalor. We already laid stress on the vast elimination of drudgery from

human life through the creation of a new race of slaves, the machines.

This—and the dis-appearance of war and the smoothing out of endless restraints to and contentions by juster social and economic arrangements—will lift the burthen of toilsome work, that has been the price of human security since the dawn of the first civilisation from the shoulders of our children which does not mean that they will cease to work, but that they will cease to do irksome work under pressure, and will work freely, planning, making, creating, according to their gifts and instinct. They will fight nature no longer as dull conscripts of the pick and plough, but for a splendid conquest. Only the spiritlessness of our present depression blinds us to the clear intimations of our reason that in the course of a few generations every little country town will become an Athens, every human being could be gentle in breeding and healthy in body and mind, the whole solid earth man's mine and its uttermost regions his playground".

---

14. DEMOCRACY VERSUS DICTATORSHIP

Democracy is a form of Government based upon self-rule of the people and in modern times upon freely elected representative institutions and an executive responsible to the people; and way of life based upon the fundamental of the equality of all individuals and their equal right to life, liberty (including the liberty of thought and expression), and the persuit of happiness. As a general concept it may be held that the democracy is a form of social organisation in which the participation of each individual

in the various phases of group activities is free from such artificial restrictions are not indispensable to the most efficient functioning of the group, and in which group policy is ultimately determined by the will of the whole society.

The basis of democratic development is the demand for equality, the demand that the system of power be erected upon the similarities and not the differences between men. Of the permanence of this demand there can be no doubt, at the very dawn of political science Aristotle insisted that its denial was the main cause of revolutions. It is because political equality, however, profound, does not permit the full affirmation of the common man's essence that the idea of democracy has spread to other spheres. It was with the French Revolution that economic equality may be said to have become a permanet part of the democratic creed. From that time, particularly in the context of socialist principle, it has been increasingly insisted that in the absence of economic equality no political mechanisms will of themselves enable the common man to realise his wishes and interests. Economic power is regarded as the parent of political power. To make the diffusion of the latter effective, the former also must be widely impossible the attainment of a common interest by state action. Economic equality is then urged as the clue upon which the reality of democracy depends.

The arguments for democracy have been set forth in three principal, variously interrelated forms, namely the doctrine of natural rights, first appearing, as a defence of democracy in the latter Middle Ages, the theory that the standard of utility, or the happiness of the many, makes democracy the preferable form of government ; and the idealist doctrine, set forth most explicitly during the last half century, that only democracy makes possible the full realisation of the most characteristic potentialities of human personality.

In the seventeenth century John Locke, a British philosopher, who sought to establish a scientific justification for the parliamentary revolution of 1688 argued that the only sort of political society justifiable, on the basis of perfect freedom of man in the natural state, was one in which the people incorporate themselves into "one body politic, wherein the majority have a right to act and conclude the rest". This is the central idea of the latter classics of democracy, su h as Rousseau's Social Contract, Paine's Rights of Man, and the great "Declaration" of the American and French Revolutions. Many of the most significant events of modern political history—the growing supermacy and gradual democratisation of the English. House of Commons, the achieveme t of American independe ee from Great Britain, the overthrow of the old autocracy in France, the later movements for written constitutions and representative parliaments, the recent independence of Indo-Pak and other Asiatic countries-have been widely interpreted as effrots to vindicate the claim that ordinary men have an inherent right to determine the form and personnel of their governments.

The utilitarian argument is that since political government has no other end than the well-being of the individual men and women that make up society and since each individual's well-being ought to count for as much as that of any other individual, a society is properly organised politically to the extent that its constitution and policy tend to promote the interests, conserve the rights, and extend the capacities and opportunities for happiness of the greatest number of individuals in the community. Democratic Government satisfies these requirements, since it is least likely to subordinate the welfare of the majority of the community to that of any part. Democracy means government by those who have the greatest concern for and the greatest awareness of the interests and rights of the people generally. The natural self-interest of human beings is the best security against

political action that is oppressive or tolerant of oppression.

It is also contended, in the utilitarian argument of democracy, that in so far as governments promote human welfare through the efficient and equitable discharge of the primary political functions furnishing protection from internal and external enemies, settling disputes, providing the means of education, and supplying certain other essential and common needs—democratic governments have actually produced results at least as satisfactory as those achieved under monarchies and aristocracies. It is also contended that in certain functions, as in alleviating poverty and removing traditional economic and social injustices they have been more prompt and thorough going than other forms of government.

Dictatorship, on the other hand, is opposed to democracy, as it means absolute control of the community by the will of a single ruler. It is a term which has undergone notable change in meaning. In the constitution of the Roman Republic it signified the temporary possession by one man of unlimited power, a trusteeship regarded as necessary to enable the state to weather a crisis. In Modern times there have been numerous instances of absolution, sometimes benevolent and acceptable, sometimes harsh and deserving the name of depotism and even tyranny. But the concept of dictatorship has until recently been kept separate and history has used it to designate an emergency assumption of power, as England, in order to escape from civil war, had to put herself temporarily, in the absolute power to her one great man—Cromwell.

But in the decade following the World War I, there was a widspread tendency to use the term 'dictatorship' as synonymous with absolutism or autocracy. In the true dictatorship the suspension of some constitutional features has in the past had as its aim the saving of the

constitution as a whole. But in the post-war dic'atorship, constitutional government was ignored or encroached upon in the interest of an ambitious hero or a privileged class, with little evidence of popular consent save man's unwillingness to resist machine gun and police agent.

This principle of one-man political rule found practical expression in Italy, Germany, and in some other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, where dictator ship were set up. Each of the dictators put himself up in power chiefly by means of armed forces, destroyed all effective opposition, in the early stages of his regime, by a policy of governmental terrorism, and retained the use of censorship, and a summary judicial procedure as normal means for dealing with political minorities. Yet each was approved, it appeared, by substantial numbers of the more intelligent citizens and was widely acclaimed by the populace. It is not difficult to find explanations for the origins of the dictatorships and for the practical successes which, in some measures, they achieved. On the one hand, the World War I, or the eonditions of the terms of peace, left each of the countries in a condition of exceptional economic and social disorder on the other hand, the normal operation of parliamentary institution was made impossible or difficu t by a general popular lassitude, in reacion from an extraordinary war discipline, and by the failure of rival democratic groups to agree on any economic programme to meet the emergency. Where the choice appeared to lie between a prepetuation of such conditions and a submission to the iron hand of ruler which, although destroying self-government and individual liberty, seemed able to meet immediate needs in the way of balancing budgets, stabilising currencies, and maintaining order-the people chose, or accepted, the latter alternative.

If democratic institutions as currently applied disable the nation from acting at all in a mutiform crisis that

demands action, it is not surprising that the people accept even welcome, the "strong man", with his bold ness the self-confidence, his readiness without debate to make decisions with those of the nation he purports to incarnate. He brings order and settles matters not by trying to persuade or by counting majorities but by his own fiat. The mass of the people dote on one who by a mystery of magnetism inspires respect, makes them feel great through their kinship with him, their national symbol. If he has the privilege of military success they love him as the nation's saviour. If he has a journalist's flair for phrasemaking his slogans may kindly enthusiasm in a newspaper reading age, giving him power comparable with that of the sophistical demogogue in the days of oratory.

Some critics of democracy and advocates af dictatorship claim that, when unusally difficult problems have to be faced, even the older damocracies confer their impotence and surrender to emergency dictatorship. Premier Poincare, it is pointed out, saved France in 1926, by persuading the French parliament to give him a "dictator's mandate" in reorganising the finances of the nation. The British in 1931, escaped financial and social disaster only by yielding to the Prim Minister Mac Donald's emotinoal plea that the votes give him and his associate carte blance in devising the fiscal and economic measures to deliver the country from its crisis, with only vague intimations as to what his measures would be. The Congress of the United States, in 1933, blindly conferred on President Roosevelt the vast discretionary powers he demanded to inflate the currency, institute governmental economies, and regulate production, prices, and working conditions in private industry and trade-as the only way to restore prosperity. If these steps were necessary, then the critics contend, democracy is discredited, for the test of a good form of government is to be found in the measure of its success in meeting the difficulties of a crisis, any form of government may work tolerably in times of hrosperity and peace.

The theoretical justification of dictatorship was set forth most extensively by Mussolini and other spokesmen for Italian Fascism, who characterised their doctrine as a "new conception of civil life" the novelty consisting essentially in an exphatic repudiation of the assumptions, ideals, and methods of modern democracy. It was the object of the Fascists to display the visionary, disintegrating, enfeebling creeds of equality and freedom by a realistic doctrine of an organic, hierarchically constituted nation, whose few most virile citizens assist a dictator in holding the multitude to the task of realising destinies more exalted than the petty aims of commonplace men.

It is obvious that dictatorship has certain advantages over democracy. A dictator can make administrative action swift, while that of a parliament is vacillating. He can satisfy the more pressing demands at once in readjusted taxation, extravagant public works, although he may thereby be storing up difficulties for himself. He is in a better position to improvise remdedy in time. But in the economic field he is under a heavy handicap, for it is here where he chiefly needs the common counsel which his regime rejects. He must depend on his own intuntion. Because he considers himself omniscient, the indispensable critical advice is hard to get, and especially to accept when one is maintained in office as the ineffable, all-powerful, all-knowing one. In external affairs the dictator's policy is cheap and easy nationalism. Hatred of the foreigner is something on which all classes may be united and stirred to an emotional pitch sufficient to divert them from consideration of lost liberty. Unluckily, caught as he is, the prisoner of the legend of his greatness that has been woven round him, the dictator is tempted into rash, and disastrous adventure. Dictatorial power seldom terminates except in lawlessness from where it generally orginates, because absolute power is the constitution's normal vigour is enfeebled during dictatorship, when the dictator is gone, there is the additional danger that would be suceessors will destroy the nation in their struggle sor mastery.

Thus whatever the original purpose of dictatorship, history indicates that it cannot avoid degeneration and when that occurs the benefits of the dictatorship are bound to be confined to those who share in its operation. Democracy, though it is not a perfect form of government, is certainly superior to dictatorhship as it is built on the sound notion that the only way of responding to the wants of total experience in modern communities is to give that experience the full opportunity of expression, and the only way to give it that freedom is to offer it in its various aspects the responsibility of sharing in power.

"Parliamentary democracy demands many virtues. It demands, of course, ability. It demands a certain devotion to work. But it demands also a large measure of cooperation of self-discipiline, of restraint. It is obvious that a House like this cannot perform any functions wi·hout a spirit of cooperation, without a large measure of restraint and self-discipline in each group. Parliamentary democracy is not something which can be created in a country by some magic wand. We know very well that there are not many countries in the world where it functions successfully. I think it may he said without any partiality that it has functioned with a very large measure of success in this country. Why? Not so much because we, the Members of this House, are examples of wisdom, but, I think, because of the background in our country, and because our people have the spirit of democracy in them.

"We have to remember that parliamentary democracy means, more so in this time of change and ferment than in ordinary times. Even when the old order is good, it has to yield place to a new one, lest one good custom should corrupt the world. Change there must be, change there has to be, particularly in a country like Pakistan which was more or less changeless for a long time, changeless not only because the dynamic aspect of the country was limited restricted and confined by foreign domination, but also

because we had fallen into ruts of our own making, in our minds, in our social framework and the rest. So we had to take our souls both from the ruts and from the disabilities and restrictions caused by alien rule. We had to make rapid changes in order to catch up.

"But, while change is necessary, there is another quality that is also necessary-a measure of continuity. There has always to be a balancing of change and continuity. Not one day is like another. We grow old each day. Yet, there is countinuity in us, unbroken continuity in the life of a nation. It is in the measure that these processes of change and continuity are balanced that a country grows on solid foundations. If there is no change and only continuity, there is stagnation and decay. If there is change only and no continuity, that means uprooting, and no country and no people can survive for long if they are uprooted from the soil which has given them birth and nurtured them.

"The system of parliamentary democracy embodies these principles of change and continuity. And it is up to those who funcitlon in this system, Members of the House and the numerous others who are part of this system, to increase the pace of change, to make it as fast as they like subject to the principle of continuity. If continuity is broken we become rootless and the system of parliamentary democracy breakes down. Parliamentary democracy is a delicate plant and it is a measure of our own success that this plant has grown sturdier during these last few years. We have faced difficult and grave problems, and solved many of them, but many remain to be solved. If there are no problems, that is a sign of death. Only the dead have no problems, the living have problems and they grow by fighting with problems and overcoming them. It is a sign of growth of this nation that not only do we solve problems, but we create problems to solve them."

15. THE PARTY SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT.

The Party-System of Government is an integral and essential part of a democracy. Political parties are possible only in a democracy, and a constitution which does not allow the free formation of political parties by admitting either no party at all or only one party is not democratic. The principle that only one party is to be allowed in order to guarantee the workability of the government is a common element of the anti-democratic ideologies of Fascism National Socialism, and Communism Fascist. Italy and National Socialist Germany were, and Communist Russia still is a typical "one-party state." A democracy cannot be a one-party state.

A political party is a group or association of people, with some degree of organistation. It is a voluntary group people are, normally, free to choose whether to join this party or that or any party at all. Like all voluntary associations it has an object or purpose, and the test or condtion of membership is the willingness to further the object or objects of the association. It is, however, possible for a party to exist and to hold together as one party while its members are deeply divided in opinion on some of the most fundamental political questions. But there is one point on which all members of a party must be agreed if they are to stay in the party and work together at all. That is in their desire to attain political power for the party. Members of a party might differ on any or even all lines of policy, but any one who definitely does not want a particular party to attain power, cannot possibly remain a member of the party. Thus a political party is a voluntary association of people for the purpose of attaining political

power, of course, by constitutional means, because violence is not permitted in a democratic set-up.

When a political party has attained political power, or a share of it, it has got to decide how to use it. In other words, it must have a policy. This means that at some point the members of the party will have to reach an agreement, not necessarily on what they would like, but at least on what they would be preparod to accept in the way of measures. It is possible, however, for a party to go on for a considerable time before arriving at such an agreement, particularly if it has no immediate prospect of attaining power. As a general rule, though there are, of course, many exceptions, differences of opinion are more noticeabe in opposition than in government parties. Further, of course, a party is not committed for ever to any particular line of policy. It may change it in whole or in part while still remaining the same party. But while it is in power it must agree in general if it is to remain there.

Regarding the motives which impel a person to attach himself to this party rather than that, they differ with different persons. Thus at one extreme we can imagine a man thinking our carefully what he would regard as most beneficial for the country as a whole and then deciding to attach himself to the party which seems to him, after full consideration, to represent most nearly his views in this matter. This would be an ideal case which would probably never be realised completely in practice. Nonetheless it would be foolish to deny that this process of rational thinking might be one among other influence which determine a particular person's decisions. We may suspect that it has played a particularly large part some cases of people who have left one party, perhaps at some personal sacrifice, and joined another.

At the other extreme there is the possibility that a man may think out clearly which party seems likely to

give most scope for his own personal interests and ambitions and then decide to join it. This also, is a possibility that is rarely realised in its completness, few poeple are as clear-sighted or single-minded as that. But here again it may be among other influences to affect a person's choice. It might be reasonable to suggest that it plays a part in certain other cases of change of party, particularly when a man leaves a party which seems to have little future before it in order to join one which appears to be on the up-grade. Of course, such a motive would work mostly on people with political ambitions, who hope to play an active part in politics.

In between these two extremes, people are influenced by the interests of the particular group, the trade class, or profession to which the person making the choice belongs. There are all the inborn temperamental differences which incline an individual towards one party or another. There is also the inflence of family connections. There is a popular idea that children always tend to react against the opinions of their parents but generally the son enters politics on the same side as the father.

There are certain inherent defects in the party system of Government. The organisation of political parties is certainly not in conformity with orthodox notions of democracy. Their internal structure is essentially autocratic and oligarchie; their leaders are not really appointed by the members, in spite of appearances but co-opted or nominated by the central body, they tend to form a ruling class, isolated from militants, a caste that is more or less exclusive. In so far as they are elected, the party oligarchy is widened without ever becoming a democracy, for the election is carried out by the members, who are a minority in comparison with those who give their votes to the party in general elections. Parliamentary representatives are increasingly subject to the authority of the party inner circle : this means that the mass of electors is dominated

by the small group of members and militants, itself subordinate to the ruling bodies of the party. Moreover, even supposing that parties were ruled by parliamentary representatives it would be an illusion to think them democratic. For elections themselves ill-interpret the true state of opinion. Parties create opinion as mech they represent it: they form it by propaganda ; they impose a prefabricated mould upon it. The party system is less a photograph of opinion than opinion is a projection of the party system.

The general development of parties tends to emphasise their deviation from the democratic regime. Growing centralisation is increasingly diminishing the influence of members over leaders, while on the other hand strengthening the influence of leaders upon members. Discipline among members is tightened by propaganda and persuation which leads them to venerate the Party and its leaders and to believe in their infallibility, the critical attitude gives way to attitude of adoration. Parliamentary representatives themselves are compelled to an obedience which transforms them into voting machines controlled by the leaders of the party. Thus there arise closed, disciplined, mechanised bodies, monolithic parties whose organisation outwardly resembles that of an army but whose methods of regimentation are infinitely more adoptable and efficient, being based on a training of minds rather than of bodies.

But in spite of these defects, the Party System Government has certain definite advantages, on account of which it has come to stay in all the democratic countries of the world. In the first place it obviously stimulates interest in politics. For party-warfare is necessarily carried on, to a great extent; by argument, and it is very difficult to go on using arguments for long without beginning to pay some attention to their value as arguments. Connected with this is the fact that the party system secures constant discussion and argument. It always provides some one to

put the opposite point of view, and, moreover, some one who cannot be ignored, as an individual critic. The government must listen to the opposition and must consider their argument as least sufficiently to find an answer to them. The party system is thus a way of stimulating these discussions and ensuring that they receive attention, and it is difficult to see what better way could be found. In general it acts as a constant reminder that there are other points of view, which have to be tolerated and, in the long run, given serious consideration.

There is another point of view on which the existence of political parties may have an effect which on the whole is beneficial. That is through their relation to particular sectional interests. Certain people who represent some particular interest will often incline to one party rather than another. But the party itself is a body with an interest of its own, which is never, or hardly ever, exactly the same as the interest of other groups or sections. A may be concerned with the interests of his particular trade and thinks that one party is more likely to favour them than another. But if he becomes an active member of a party he will never think in precisely the same way when he is thinking as a member of the party as he will when he is thinking as a member of a particular trade or the interest. At the least, as a member of a party he will have to think about winning votes, and exclusive concern for the interests of his particular trade is not likely to be successful in that aim. No doubt in some countries at sometimes the political party may become little more than a company formed for the purpose of sharing out the spoils of office, though even there it may be concerned to prevent exploitation by rival interests. But where a higher standard rules, the party and its interest always provide some sort of counter weight to the influence of other special interests.

Another great advantage of the party System from the democratic point of view is that it always provides a possible alternative government and gives the electorate a choice between them. Under the one-party system there is no alternative government and no genuine choice before the electors, so that the influence of the mass of the people on political decision is reduced to a minimum.

Discussing the merits and demerits of the party system and Its place in the machinery of democratic government, Prof. M. A. Pink has rightly observed in his brilliant book, *The Challenge to Democracy*: "The working of the party system is apt to generate a certain amount of impatience, especially among the more intelligent member of the community who find the trammels of a party programme irksome. With the growth of the scientific habit of mind and the application of scientific methods to the study of social problems there has grown up a natural desire to see the great political questions handled by the best men according to their expert judgment of the needs of the particular situations and not according to preconceived party ideas. It is also felt desirable that the parlimentary debates should exhibit less vain repetition, and the members should be free to yield to argument and vote according to their private conviction without constant fear of the party Whips. The party system has indeed obvious drawbacks. But it has the inestimable merit of providing for the bloodness revolution by which a government that ceases to enjoy public confidence can be turned out of office and replaced by a new one. Thus until some better device is invented it remains indispensable to the working of democratic government.

"At the same time, however, we must recognise that the old, limited conception of party politics is out of date. As we move towards a planned society it is no longer possible to treat the art of government as considering solely in securing the programme and the interests of the party in

power. Any intellingent and comprehensive plan in the social and economic spheres must be made on the assumption that there will be continuity of policy over a period of time. Such continuity can be secured, of course, by a revolutionary dictatorship that suppresses all opposition but so long as conflict of opinion is tolerated, long-term plans for industry, for transport, for social security, for education must be based on a programme representing the widest measure of agreement between the parties obtainable at the moment. It follows that those who represent the parties and mould national policy must be prepared at some point to sink partisanship in co-operation. The point has been well put by Karl Mannheim : "Planned democratic society needs a new type of party system, in which the right to criticise is as strongly developed as the duty to be responsible to the whole. That means that the liberal education for intelligent partisanship, which is mainly defending the interests of your faction aud party and leaves the final integration to a large extent to the natural harmony of interests, must gradually be replaced by a new education for responsiple criticism, wherein consciousness of the whole is at least as important as awareness of your own interests. In the planned society it is not the national interplay of interests which gradually leads to a total scheme of action, but plan intelligently conceived and accepted by all parties. It is obvious that such a new morality can only be achieved if the deepest sources of human regeneration assist the rebirth of society".

"Democratic government will continue to work through the conflict of parties ; but both politicians and ordinary citizens must reach out to a conception beyond party. Above all, the party in power must realise its full responsibilities to the community as a whole". They will need to be considered in the light of the existing situation and the best expert advice. When no real cleavage of opinion is involved, would it not be possible to take the problem out of the arena of party conflict?."

16. COMMUNISM

Communism has many implications. In practice, few textbooks or reference books agree in defining it. At the same time politicians are inclined to over-simplify and concentrate on one of its many implications as a definition. Communism, generally, may be defined as the system of society in which property, particularly real property and the means of production, is held in common. This, with the implication of "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs" is the classic definition. However, as communism developed in Russia the first apparent need was a need for planning production rather than for the total state ownership of land and the means of production. So, in a definition of communism, today state planning and the means of enforcing conformity to the plan are of the first importance.

The theory of communism was first created by two German philosophers of the mid-nineteenth century, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In formulating their ideology they borrowed various ideas from other philosophers particulary Hegel, Adam Smith and Ricardo. Among these various proponents of socialism at the time, Marx and Engels were distinguished by their great emphasis on production of material goods. In this respect the two men were very close to certain modern capitalist economists. They were, however, true socialist, believing in equal distribution of wealth, and having little faith in the private property system.

The philosophy of Marx and Engels is fundamentally a reinterpretation of world economic history. In their view the history of mankind could be roughly divided into successive major periods. First, there was the prehistoric era, in which man barely eked out an existence. This was followed by the slave state period exemplified by the Roman Empire the age of feudalism and serfdom ; and

finally, the modern period of capitalism with the industrial revolution. In turn each period achieved a higher degree of production than its predecessors. Thus temporary setbacks and minor exceptions, the history of mankind represents slow but continual progress in increassing the production of the material goods which man needs for existence.

However, according to Marx and Engels, once the prehistoric period passed, each economic system had class groups of exploiters and exploited, and this prevented equal distribution of wealth. Thus, they maintained, the exploiting class in Rome was the patricians, in medieval times, the feudal lords, and under capitalism, the bourgeoisie. Each of these exploiting groups had held its powers by possessing or controlling the means of production such as arable land, commercial forests, industrial machinery, factories.

Marx and Engels believed that with the advance of capitalism and the rise of the Industrial Revolution, mankind had finally neared a stage in which it could almost produce sufficient material goods for full satisfiction of its needs. But to them, the system of capitalism itself had great faults, which prevented an equal distribution of material goods. For example, capitalism suffered periodic depressions, during which such means of production as factories would stand idle, though there was need for their products. Furthermore, the means of production were still in the hands of an alleged exploiter class, the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, the class of industrial workers, who actually operated the means of production had a very low standard of living, and could not afford to buy an adequate amount of products of their own factories.

The remedy for this situation of relative abundance of goods but unequal distribution, according to Marx and Engels, was to change capitalism in socialism. To effect this change, Marx and Engels believed that the class most exploited under capitalism, the industrial proletariat,

would rule the state and establish complete socialism. When socialism (public control of both production and distribution of goods) had been fully established so that each individual's needs were satisfied, the state authority would gradually wither away and be replaced by voluntary co-operation of the entire populace, all adult members of which would be engaged in some form of productive work.

Engels and Marx held various other views elaborating upon and confirming the above theories. According to their economic history, each great historial era (slave-state, feudalism and capitalism), had first represented progress over the preceding civilisation. But in their later stages, each of these forms of economic society had declined no longer could or would continue increasing production, and was finally replaced was brought about by a new-class seizing control of the means of production. Thus, the feudal nobles seized the production from the Roman patricians, and later lost power to the capitalist bourgeoisie. According to such reasoning, the capitalist system would also decline, and must be replaced by a new society. Thus socialism could logically replace capitalism, and the means of production pass from the hands of the bourgeoisie to those of the proletariat.

Another argument of Marx and Engels was the wastefulness of class struggle, which in their opinion had always existed. Thus, in the slave-state, the patricians and plebians had quarrelled, during feudalism, the nobility and the serfs and under capitalism, the industrial proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Both philosophers considered that such struggles hampered production and thus prevented the output of material goods needed by society. In their view, a socialist state would eliminate these difficulties by abolishing classes, thus turning the entire populace into a proletariat means of production.

Another feature of Marxism, as the teachings of Engels and Marx came to be called, was international solidarity of the working classes. According to both men, quarrels between states were allegedly quarrels between their ruling classes, that is, the bourgeoisie of each country. Marx and Engels claimed that the real enemy of a proletariat is the bourgeoisie, not a foreign nation. Thus, by this reasoning, the proletariat of the world should unite against the world bourgeoisie. In fact, Marx actually started a First International for this purpose.

In recent times the meaning of the word communism has been narrowed down to that interpretation of Marxian doctrine proposed by Lenin when he came to power in Russia as a result of the revolution in November, 1917, and on the basis of which he and his followers tried to transform society in Russia. Communism in that sense is only one of the possible inter-pretations of Maxian socialism and leading socialists from the beginning having attacked Lenin's theory and its realisation in Russia. While socialism put its faith in an evolutionary development and in democratic means of attaining the liberation of all men from economic servitude, communism regarded revolution and ensuing dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary period of transition to the future free and equalitarian society in which everyone would contribute to the common good according to his abilities and would receive according to the needs. According to communist theory, the social revolution—accomplished in the interests of the proletariat and, after the abolition of class society, of all men—must be conducted by the "proletariat's advance guard," the communist party, because the people as a whole and even large parts of the proletariat, educated in the pre-socialist era in the bourgeoisie concepts of life, are unable to grasp and to realise the new order immediately. As the instrument of this participation they accepted the workers, soldiers and peasants' councils (the Russian word for council is soviet) which had been

formed during the Russian revolution in 1905. In these soviets only the working class were represented, not the "capitalists" or "exploiters" the mode of election was carefully regulated that only deputies belonging to or approved by the party were chosen. But communism, differing in that respect from fascism, regards dictatorship as a transitional institution, and full democracy as the goal. It believes that true democracy cannot be realised in capitalistic society on account of the economic exploitation imposed upon the economically weaker elements of society, and that the generally accepted form of parliamentary democracy only veils the control of society by capitalists. While fascists believes in the unalterable and beneficial inequality of men and races and appeals the instincts of man which have their origins in the past, communism, believes in the equality of all men and races, and its outlook is based on reason as a common element in all men and as a guide for the construction of the future.

Economic and political measures predominate in the Communist programme as long as the unfavourable environment persists. If the privileges of social life, are to be made available equally to all who share the burdens of that life, society must be made the owner of the instrumentalities of the labour. The socialist system of distribution and ownership is so completely in opposition to the capitalist system of alloting privileges unequally, without any relation to differences in effort, that the transfer of control from capitalists to socialists has to be by a process that is abrupt and violent, there can be no gradual and voluntary combination of the opposing groups nor any merging of their policies by a process of concession and compromise. A catatrophic social revolution is the first step in the achievement of communism. The next, and longer, step in the concentrated and coercive rule made necessary, on the one hand, by the counter-efforts of a minority bent on regaining their privileges of the old order, and, on the other hand, by the intertia of a

majority inexperienced and undisciplined in the ways of the new order.

It is chiefly in this emphasis upon the impossibility of a free and democratic socialist government—resting on the consent of the governed and recognising no private rights against itself—that Russian Communists may be said to differ from the orthodox Marxians in the western states. Many writers, of widely varying social doctrines, hold that rule by a minority, forcibly guiding an incompetent and inert majority and denying any claims of particular interests against the collective interest, is the mark of every community that attempts to act in an organic way The Communists qualify this general doctrine of artistocratic and authoritarian collectivism by the specification that every coercive political rule over a community is inevitably by and for the immediate benefit of some class within the community. Political authority is never an expression of social solidarity; where there is solidarity, the authority is not needed. The state is always the organisation of a class, controlled by the most intelligent, energetic, and class-conscious minority, within the class. The Communist state, its spokesmen contend, is, however, unique that represents the largest class within the community and is a definite preparation for a future classless and stateless society. Meanwhile, it governs frankly in the interest of one class against that of another. In this policy it is always raising up a hitherto submerged group and bringing down a privileged group. The Communist policy, therefore, in contradistinction to the policy of capitalism, progressively diminishes rather that accentuates the difference between the two classes and thereby gradually merges them into a single community. Indeed the Communist programme is intended to destroy eventually every group that insists on remaining a class. Thus proletarian class rule is an intermediate, transitional, stage of society between capitalist class rule and the classless commonwealth of the

future. And when classes disappear, coercive social rule disappears. The communists, following Marx, held that under socialism the state "withers away". For them, as for most other schools, of political doctrine, freedom is the ultimate goal. They believe that state power, which is the embodiment of class, rule, vanishes in proportion the vanishing of classes. The Moletariat only needs the state temporarily.

---

17. CAPITALISM

Capitalism means the entrusting of the economic process of society to the guidance of the private business-man It first developed in eighteenth century in Britain, later it was transplanted to north-western Europe and North America. From the very beginning of capitalism it has been characterised by a few basic traits.

In the first place, ownership of the means of production (land, factories, machinery, natural resources) is, in the capitalist system, held by individuals, not by the state. This does not exclude public ownership of natural monopolies or basic public services, but such cases are considered the exception rather than the rule. Thus capitalist business is typically private, so that economic initiative is lodged with enterprises which are actuated by the quest for private gain. These enterprises, subject to little regulation from outside, assume the full risk of failure but enjoy also the unrestricted change of success. Their activity keeps the economic machinery of society in motion.

The structure of capitalist economy is aristocratic. The number of economic agents is small as compared with

the total number of persons participating in economic life, with the result that a large majority is subject to the power of a few economic agents. In a regime of economic freedom the relation between the economic agent and the persons controlled by him takes appropriately the legal form a free contract. The dominance of minority is explained by the fact that because of the high standard of technical knowledge and organisational skill required under capitalism people of average abilities and fortunes are incapable of assuming the direction of production and can, therefore, no longer act as economic agents as they could under the handicrafts system.

Another essential characteristic of the capitalist economy is competition. In the precapitalist economy, custom and usage dictated what goods and services were worth, and there were many persons who could not compete at all, because they were excluded from certain occupations. In the capitalist economy, everybody is free to choose whatever line of work he prefers, and there is to be no artificial restriction or exclusion, such as on the basis of racial of religious prejudice, from any occupation or profession. Similarly, the capitalist market provides the place where goods and services are offered for sale, the quantity and quality of which are regulated by free competition. The freedom to compete in the market results from four basic capitalist freedoms ; freedom of trade and occupation, freedom of contract, freedom of property, and freedom of profit making. To the extent that any of these four freedoms is curbed, free competition is reduced. The economic justification of competition is that it keeps everybody—worker, businessman, investor on his toes, constantly alert the changes in the market, and constantly on the lookout for ways to increase his efficiency and thereby improve his chances on the market.

For about a hundred years after its introduction the capitalist system succeeded admirably. Karl Marx the

greatest critic of capitalism, wrote in the Communist Manifesto, "Capitalism, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man, machinery application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents by cultivation, canalisation of rivers whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forced slumbered in the lap of social labour...... Capitalism has accomplished wonders for surpassing, Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueductes, and Gothic cathedrals, it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former migrations of nations and crusades".

There is no doubt that the capitalist eystem has accomplished much. In the United States, where the capitalist system prevails, the population increased six times between 1850 and 1950, yet her national income increased thirty times. The Americans claim that the abolition of slavery, education for all, health facilities on an unprecendented level, social security for everybody, the doubling of longevity, within a century, the highest increase of population on record—all coincide with the development of capitalism. Moreover, in the field of education, health, and welfare, more has been accomplished in capitalist societies in a spirit of service, and disinterestedness that ever before in history. In the world today the great charitable foundations are to be found primarily in the capitalist nations. In the United States, for example, the Ford Foundations has assets of over 500 million dollars, and it annually disburses between 40 and 50 million dollars for purpose of education, human welfare, world peace, and the strengthening of freedom and democracy at home and abroad.

They further claim that capitalism has some describable political implications. The individual risk taking,

the desire and capacity to make decisions, to assume responsibility, to determine one's own life, are an important motivation without which there can be no democracy. Persons who constantly faced danger, risk, and responsibility in their economic affairs were ultimately unwilling to accept authoritarian government from kinds and aristocracies, and when the capitalist middle classess could not obtain their objectives peacefully, they resorted to revolution ; the English civil war in the seventeenth century, and the American and French Revolution in the eighteenth century. In fighting for itself, the capitalist middle class appealed to the principles of universal human liberty, the rights of man, and natural law. It is for this reason that democracy became an intrinsic part of capitalist civilisation, and for this reason also that greatest advances in democratic government and human liberty have so far been made in capitalist societies.

But in spite of these achievements which go to the credit of capitalism, there are certain inherent defects in this system which are condemned by all rightminded social thinkers. The main drawback in the capitalistic system is that business processes are carried on in terms of 'wealth', 'value,, 'price', and 'cost'. These concepts are pecuniary and in individual instances have little or no necessary relationship to human welfare, webreas the ultimate purpose to be served by economic activity is the generation of human well-being. Since money has no consistent and inherent relationship to human welfare decisions made on pecuniary basis may, and in a substantial number of cases, do, differ widely from decisions which would be dictated by considerations of human welfare. The emphasis which the system places upon pecuniary values undoubtedly affects our personal and social evalations of nonbusiness phenomena. The "successful citizen" is likely to be the man who is the most successful financially, friendships may follow patterns of pecuniary success, art, music and literature may be threatened by tests of the pecuniary

worth of their products, a college education may come to be judged largely in terms of its effects upon the prospective money earnings of its recipients, and so forth.

Another defect of the capitalist system is that it has given rise to unearned incomes. An unearned income is the acquisition of economic goods or purchasing power from any source other than the sale of personal productive effort on a competitive market. Capitalism has permitted income of this type to exist, and in certain cases has unavoidably created them. Their existence means that certain individuals are thereby enabled to live, and in many cases to live well, without working. It means that some are overpaid for their efforts and hence others are underpaid, for the total national product is the sole source of individual incomes. If certain citizens consume without helping to produce the total heap of consumable goods, others must obtain from the heap less than they have added to it. Resultant potentialities of class antagonism may interfere with the harmony and cooperation that are essen'ial to the most efficient operation of a complex economy.

Another weakness in capitalism is that, on numerous occasions and in many ways, it has offered businees units powerful' inducements to reduce productions and restrict supply of goods. It has permitted a perversion of the profit motive to ends just the opposite of those it is supposed to serve. Whereas profit normally is expected to be realised through production and the expansion of productive facilities, it can also result from restricting output and obtaining a relatively high profit per unit of sales. Business enterprises have not failed to respond to such opportunities.

Capitalist system also results in waste of productive effort. Since no economic organisation can achieve perfect efficiency in the utilisation of resources, some waste

is inherent in all economic activity. Under the capitalist system, however, wastes of gross proportions have persisstently resulted from the existence of competition. Competition has created a tendency for industrial equipment and staffs of workers to be unnecessarily duplicated. Each competitor in a given industry, needing to be fully equipped with machinery and labour to carry on production, acquires them without considering the possibility that the market may not absorb all the potential output of all the available productive facilities. The result is idle equipment and waste.

Capitalism emphasizes the acquisitive and combative elements in human nature, thereby suppressing altruistic and cooperative potentialities. Under such institutions as private property and the profit motive, individuals place great emphasis upon acqiring and owning things they contrive to exclude other persons from the use of as large a portion of the world's goods as they can. This is often done in a spirit of combat and under the assumption that the other person must be an enemy. The institution of competition and the existence of the free market induce struggle and spirit of opposition. Each person, assuming that the other is actuated by self-interest, finds it necessary to put his own interest uppermost. Acquisition, self-seeking, and conflict thus become predominant environmental influences that help to shape the psychological development of people. Potential cooperative and altruistic tendeneies wither for lack of stimulus, while combative urges are developed and expanded.

Just as individualism was the element giving strength to capitalism and according for its many successes so the individualistic nature of capitalist institution is largely responsible for capitalism's failure. Being free to make his decisions without regard to the decisions of others, the individual or corporate entity establishes a new business unit when it appears profitable to him, despite the duplication and social waste it may occasion. He or it makes

these decisions which will yield profit regardless of the fact that the aggregate of such decisions may be leading to a socially unhealthy 'bomb or 'lust'. The individual seeks to climb to the top of the income ladder and, through private property and inheritance, to preserve his place there for his son even though this may lead to injurious permanent class divisions and distinctions. Should he see the opportunity to achieve a monopoly profit or some other from of unearned income, he utilises free enterprises and capitalist property institutions to attain this end. If creating scarcity rather than plenty serves his interests, capitalist institutions often permit him to follow the former path.

To sum up the advantages and disadvantages of capitalism, we can say that whereas, with the use of accumlated individual savings, it has given the world railroads, automobiles, steampships, etc. and has encourged individual initiative, it has also given rise to waste in the production of goods, inequality in the distribution of wealth, and economic insecurity of the worker who is entirely at the mercy of the employer, and an emphasis on property right rather than on human rights. These defects have been demonstrated in the long hours workers must toil to make a living, in bad working conditions, in the manner in which women and children have been exploited and in the payment of low wages. Although much has been done in some capitalist countries like the U. S. A. and Britain, to improve the system the inherent defects still remain.

18. SCIENCE AND HUMAN HAPPINESS

Modern age is the age of scienice, and much of human happines depends on the way in which man makes use of the vast power that science has placed in his hands. In fact

it is impossible to imagine how the modern man can survive in the absence of the various discoveries and inventions which the scientists have made from time to time and in which have rendered his life comfortable and worth living. Think of electricity, the aeroplane; the railway, the motor car, wonderful drugs, and thousand and one other achievements of science, which have become indispensable for our day-to-day existence. But apart from these discoveries and inventions, science has given man something which is much more useful-the scientific outlook which is essential for his further development and progress.

Scientific outlook helps a man ascertain facts, grasp them accurately, and find explanation for them. It gives him a training in observation, in precision, in abjectivity, and in a rational habit of mind. It introduces him to the material world and thereby widens immensely the horizon of the mind, extends its range, gives it a sense of infinite possibilities, and makes life more interesting and alive. It is rare to find a scientist who is pessimist or defeatist, for he lives in an atmosphere of progress, of creation, with the promise of a heaven-at least of earth. The scientist is an explorer of an unknown world with infinite possibilities of discovery and not only is the act of discovery exciting, but it leads on to actions, to practical results. It seeks to know, but also to transform the world, and this is a further excitment and stimulus to those who follow it.

Scientific outlook engenders a tendency to analyse every object. Modern age being the age of science, can be

rightly termed as the age of analysis. Chemistry resolves matters into elements, physics resolves it into atoms, biology resolves organic life into cells. Now this analytic spirit which is born of scientific outlook has become characteristic of any kind of scientific inquiry in any field. When we say that the temper of modern civilisation is scientific we mean not only that natural science engages a large part of its thoughts and determines much of its life but that our civilisation is scientific in the sense in which the Greeks used philosophy, that it 'loves wisdom', that in all fields it desires to seek knowledge and make knowl.dge its servants and its marter. So literary studies employ the scientific method so far their subject-matter allows, a writer is 'explained' in terms of his ancentry, his early life, his education, the character of his age, the influence and intellect, his subconscious mind etc. The modern historian influenced by scientific outlook analyses events into their causes into economic, geographic facts, into the impact of contemporary thought or the impact of individuals.

But the various scientific discoveries and inventions and the scientific outlook which the study of science has engendered have not proved to be unmixed blessings for mankind. Science has, no doubt, made man's life more comfortable, healthy and bright, and it has been also given him the forward look, and the spirit of inquiry, but it has also brought about certain complication and created some new problems which stand in the way of human happiness.

For exampl ; science has upset international relations

by annihilating space. It has abolished distance, made the five Continents adjacent countries, and unified the world. At the beginning of the nineteenth century a letter from England took weeks, in favourable circumstances to reach America and its arrival was uncertain. Today one can speak from London to a friend in New York within fifteen minutes and be with him in twelve hours. All kinds of materials can be now brought from distant countries at a much cheaper price than could be imagined a hundred years ago, Under such circumstances the international relations of the past are an anachronism, and fit the body politic as ill as the clothes of a child fit a grown up man. But the people of different nations have not yet developed the outlook demanded by modern condition, and they still think in an issolated and provincial manner of an earlier age to which steam and electricity were unknown. This fact has created a serious problem which is responsible for much of modern conflicts in the international field, and which has led to much human misery in the form of wars.

Another problem created by science is that it has given man the power to abolish poverty, but this power has brought fortune in the hands of a few nations. Who are-too uneducated to spend it intelligently. Instead of using huge amounts of wealth placed in the hands of the scientifically advanced nations of the world, for the good of mankind as a whole, these nations are trying to exploit the poorer nations, and dominate them politically and economically. Every capacity is a capacity for evil as well as for good, and each addition to human power is a chance to

misues it. For example, the printing press has distributed more falsehood, and beauty. Thus the very wealth of objects and enjoyments, good and bad, useful and useless, which applied science has put at the disposal of a world that has not yet learnt to choose good and refuse evil, is a menace to true civilisation.

Modern technology, whereas it has greatly accelerated the industrial progress of the world has impaired one of the purest enjoyments and major virtues of humanity - crafts-manship - replacing it by mass manufacture, turning the skilled worker into an automation on the production line, making men richer in their possessions and poorer in themselves. Ruskin, who 'saw as the gravest danger to true civilisation the struggle between man and the machinery for mastery, whether it appears in the degradation of the operative or the unthinking exultation in mechanical achivement' rightly remarked : "No changing of place at a hundred miles an hour, nor making of stuffs a thousand yards a minute, will make us one whit stronger happier, or wiser. There was alwaye more in the world than men could see, walked they every so slowly, they will see it no better for going fast. As for being able to talk from place to place, that is indeed, well and convenient, but suppose you have, originally, nothing to say ; we shall be obliged at last to confess, what we should long ago have known that the really precious things are thought and sight, not pace. It does a bullet no good to go fast, and if a man be truly a man no harm to go slow, for his glory is not at all in going, but in being":

Apart from the problems created by scientific discoveries and inventions, scientific outlook is also not free from certain glaring disadvantages. A purely scientific education uncorrected by other influences, has a narrowing effect. Natural science seems so all-embracing, that we do not notice that vast regions of life—and these the most important—do not come within its view, and a mind dominated by it would naturally be inclined to ignore or underestimate them. It has little to say about those creations of the human spirit which also are immortal, great literature or great art. Moreover, the spirit of analysis engendered by scientific outlook, has got its own serious limitations. By subjecting everything to minute analysis we, in the words of Wordsworth, 'murder to dissect'. The parts, even if they are complete, are not the same as the whole. Dissolved into atoms the solid world is no longer itself. Reduced to cells or to an amalgam of psychological impulses, human beings 'no more make that whole which commands our devotion, that some shredded dissections of human tatters is that warm and breathing beauty of flesh which our hearts find delightful'. Analyse a thing and the life leaves it, but life is the most important thing in the world, and analysis not only does not help us to see it, but it encourages us—so potent and interesting and engrossing is it—to forget the existence of what it cannot reveal.

Thus whereas science has, to a great extent, contributed to human happiness, it has also created some crucial problems which, if not adequately solved, will jeopardise human existence, and bring untold misery to mankind. But we cannot blame science for this, it is man who is to blame. Under the new conditions created by science, man must change his primitive outlook. Science is guiltless, it is our hands that are unclean. Science goes steadily about her work, revealing the greatness of man, and if he misuses it, he is to be blamed for it. The gifts of science do not corrupt man. If new problems are created by the

discoveries and inventions of science, and man is exposed to new temptations, and thrown into confusion, it does not mean that he should go back on science. We must go forward, and extend the empire of science, following the argument where it leads'. A great new force that comes into the world is revolutionary, and for the moment upsets and confuses the minds of men. That was true of all great movements as of science. In course of time man will prove himself equal to the task of solving these problems and meet the new challenge successfully, and will certainly survive the crisis precipitated by science as he has survived many in the past.

The most astounding modern inventions which has brought mankind almost to the verge of annihilation is the invention of the atomic and hydrogen bomb. But we do hope that man will be able to survive this circis, and use these tremendous energies for his benefit rather than for his destruction, as he has done in the past with various other inventions, which were fraught with dangerous consequences for mankind. Already the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations is devoting extensive and unflagging attention to the biological and medical effects of radian energy—both those that may prove to be beneficient and those that may maim or kill. When man first discovered fire he began a large apprenticeship to caution in dealing with what is both useful and dangerous—and the end is not yet. The story of the Garden of Eden and the myth of the Promethean fire find uncanny parallels in the huge responsibilities of Atomic Energy Commission to control the unprecendented forces of atomic energy for the welfare of men. To control the use of this power, explore its nature, its implications and potential applications and at the same time to protect us against all dangers — these possibilities set a series of tasks that also are without precedent and all but immeasureable. Ultimately 'man is the measure of all things', and we do hope that he will in course of time

learn to control the power that science has placed in his hand, and also adjust himself to the changed conditions in such a manner that it will contribute to his happiness.

Albert Einstein, the greatest scientist of modern times, gave the key to the problem of science and human happiness, when he remarked, in his speech to the students of California University: "Why does this magnificent applied science, which saves work and makes life easier, bring us so little happiness ?

The simple answer runs—because we have not yet learned to make a sensible use of it.

"In war, it serves that we may poison and mutilate each other. In space, it has made our lives hurried and uncertain. Instead of freeing us in great measure from spiritually exhausing labour, it has made men into slaves of machinery, who for the most part complete their monotonous long days's work with disgust and must continually tremble for their poor rations.

"You will be thinking that the old man sings an ugly song. I do it, however, with a good purpose, in order to point out a consequence.

"It is not enough that you should understand about applied science in order that your work may increase man's blessings. Concern for man himself and his fate must always form the chief interest of all technical endeavours, concern for the great unsolved problems of the organisation of labour and the distribution of goods—in order that the creations of our mind shall be a blessing and not a curse to mankind. Never forget this in the midst of your diagrams and equations".

"Science is rather distorted when it is sought to serve particular ends, particular beliefs and particularly ideology. There is no such thing as 'Capitalist science' or 'Communist science'. Science is science just like truth is truth. If truth is called capitalist truth or Communist truth-you are excluding something from it.

"It has been an interesting experience to see the reaction to the Sputnik of various people and various countries. Every scientist, of course, accalimed it and other hailed it as a great event, something very commendable and praiseworthy. Nevertheless it is fortunate that it was considered from the point of view of politics and world conflicts and power conflicts with the result the essential nature of scientific part of it was covered up by political and other aspects. This has led to some reaction of fear among some people that this terrible thing can be turned into a weapon and can be used against them. How can you look upon it as science ?

"Certainly we want science to be used for the betterment of human beings and humanity. Pure science is important because it is a search for truth. Nevertheless we want to apply it for betterment of human beings. It is not only justified but it is right. On the other hand, if in the pursuit of that objective you make science and the pursuit of truth a kind of handmaid to set policies which you have in mind—political or other—then, perhaps the temper of science is affected and the approach to science is not exactly what it should be. I have been putting some ideas—for your consideration because science has become intimately tied up with various world conflicts. Today it has become part of what is called cold war. Apart from cold war not being desirable it is a bad thing for science to be tied up with it.

"One sees on the one hand people some time praising science and other times becoming very apprehensive because science has led to discoveries and use of the tremendous powers of nature which can be used for good or evil and which has produced terrible weapons of mass slaguter. Surely that is not the fault of science. It is the fault of human beings which misuse science. Science is neutral as truth is neutral. There is no question of its being positive or negative. It is no good blaming science or scientists. If you blame science you can as well blame knowledge. Knowledge misused is dangerous, yet we want and seek knowledge. We must know how to use it properly.

"We do live in an extraordinary age when skies are filled up day and night by planes carrying hydrogen bombs. It is an extraordinary thought that a loss of nerve by the commander of the aircraft or a slight mistake or organisation might lead to terrific consequences. All these are being done as a measure of precaution. It does appear strange that we have been reduced to such straits as to take such enormous risks as a measure of precaution. It is not good blaming science for it. Science must go on. The moment science ceases to develop, the nations become static and decay. We have to establish ourselves to the approach and ways of science so as to benefit by it and not to use it for evil purposes.

"Scientists, therefore, should gradually develop something of the wisdom of the sages and something of the

compassion of saints. Science thus far had not been conditional by saintly things. Sometimes those who dealt with them in that way duluded themselves and went astray. It was rather dangerous. Yet, the fact remainded that a good deal of wisdom was necessary as also a good deal of compassion and not merely scientific discoveries and achievements, good and essential as the latter were".

"The scientist is to be an objective seeker after truth. Science has grown because in a large measure the great scientists have sought truth in that way. But I suppose no man today, even a scientist can live in a world of his own, in some kind of ivory tower, cut off from what is happening. Therefore, science today has perhaps begun to cross the borders of morals and ethics. If it gets divorced completely from the realm of morality and ethics than the peer it possesses may be used for evil purposes. But above all, if it ties to the gospel of hatred and violence, then undoubtedly it will have taken a wrong direction which will bring much peril to the world. I plead with the scientists here and elsewhere to remember that the scientific spirit is essentially one of tolerance, one of humility, one of realisation that somebody else may also have a bit truth. Scientists should note that they do not have a monopoly of the truth ; that nobody has a monopoly, no country, no people, no book. Truth is to vast too be contained in the minds of human beings or in books, however sacred".

19. LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE

Science has made such an outstanding progress during the last three hundred years, and it is expanding with and advancing so rapid, that some people have begun to think that it has conquered all frontiers of human knowledge, and that there is no limit to its progress But a critical understanding of the various aspects of scientific knowledge reveals to us the fact that science is working under many limitations, and that what we consider to be infalliable to-day in the matter of scientific the ries, may prove to be baseless tomorrow.

The limitations of science are quite obvious when it deals with living matter. Many of the questions that seem to us quite fundamental have not yet been answered by science. For instance, science does not tell us what makes us regard a living organism as a whole, and what we really mean by the vague notions of 'wholeness' or 'individuality'. Even if every bodily activity of a living organism was explained in terms of physical and chemical changes, science does not account for the purposive order of these changes, because 'purpose' is not yet a scientific notion. The biologists following the methcd of physicists and chemists are reluctant to introduce any ideas which have not been found necessary in physics and chemistry. The result is that the most fundamental problems of biology i.e., the 'wholeness' or 'individuality' of a living organism, are not yet even approached. Professor Whitehead, one of the greatest of Western philosophers of modern times, referring to the application of the notions of physics and chemistry to life, has forcibly put the case thus :

'The brilliant succese of this method is admitted. But you cannot limit a problem by reason of method of attack. The problem is to understand the operations of an animal body. There is clear evidence that certain operations of certain animal bodies depend upon the foresight of an end and the purpose to attain it. It is no solution of the problem to ignore this evidence because other operations have been explained in terms of physical and chemical laws. The existence of a problem is not even acknowledged. It is vehemently denied. Many a scientist has patiently designed experiments for the purpose of substantiating his belief that animal operation are motivated by no purposes. He has perhaps spent his spare time in writing articles to prove that human beings are as other animals so that 'purpose' is a category irrelevant for the explanation of their bodily activities, his own activities included. Scientists animated by the purpose of proving that they are purpose-less constitute an interesting subject for study.

"Another reason for the extrusion of final casuation is that it, introduces a dangerous mode of facile explanation. This is certainly true. The laborious work of tracing the sequence in physical antecedents is apt to be damaged by the facile suggestion of a final cause. Yet the mere fact the introduction of the notion of final casuation has its dangers is no reason for ignoring a real problem. Even if heads be weak, the problem remains".

There is every justification in Professor Whitehead's indictment, because the primary concepts of the biologists are not adequate to their most important problems. For instance there is enough lacunae in the great theory of

natural selection. We may give a ready assent to a demonstration in physics but we cannot easily believe that the whole evolution of living forms on earth has been the result of random variations' and the struggle for existence. It offers no explanation of the most obvious fact about the upward tendency of living things. It requires an extraordinary act of faith suppose that the actual progress of life can be explained in the terms adopted by the biologists. Some of them recently introduced such notions as 'vital force' entelechy', 'notion', and so on, these terms have not yet been made definite enough to be used for scientific purposes. Some new concepts of biology are essential in order to find the key to living organism.

Besides biology, when contrasted with physical, science, seems even more inadequate. The psychological theory that sticks most closely to the terms of mechanics is Behaviourism, which is hopelessly inadequate. Behaviourism, in its strict form, says that what we call mental processes are in reality bodily movements. When we see that we are thinking of something, or perceiving something, this statement really means that our body is behaving in a certain way. Behaviourism gets rid of what call 'mind altogether. We do not think ; we make incipient speech movements. We do not perceive anything ; or adjust our eyeballs.

It is true that there is much in the behaviour of other people, as when we are listening to a conversation on politics, for example, which give no evidence of thinking, and which suggests that purely automatic reactions are taking place. But it is more surprising to learn that Behaviourist finds no evidence of thought process within himself. The fact is, that each of us is immediately aware within himself of sensations, images, imagination, and reasoning. And we have not, in practice, the slighest doubt that we are correctly imputing these activities to

other people. A compass needle, in following the movements of a magnet, is certainly, according to the Behaviourist, "perceiving' the magnet. But we know that with our perceptions, even if our bodily behaviour is as regular and automomatic as that of the magnet, something more is involved. And this something more is, of course, the sensations, images etc. of which we are directly aware. According to Behaviourism these sensations, images, etc, must all be reducible to bodily movements. They must be identical with bodily movements. From our personal experiences, we find that this is impossible, and, therefore Behaviourism has been rejected by many thinkers, who regard this theory as preposterously silly.

The Behaviourist explanation of other mental processes such as memory, is similarly deficient. According to this theory memory means nothing except the fact that when we meet similar stimulus again after an absence, we do the 'habitual thing' that we learned to do when we were in the presence of that stimulus in the first place. This is obviously an inadequate explanation, because if by 'old habitual thing' is meant verbal habits, then it is untrue. We can, and do describe a past experience in many different forms of words, and the constant element in these different descriptions is their meaning. If they are mere verbal habits we must assume that we have been spending a large portion of our lives in rehearsing every possible form of words in which everything we remember can be said.

Besides putting forward theories on a basis of fact all too small to support them, the Behaviourists also put forward theories which are opposed to direct experiences. They deny obvious fact. Thus they deny that we can form images in our minds - visual. auditory, and so on. Those of us who are strong visualisers or who take pleasure in mentally 'hearing' favourite musical works, know that the statement is merely untrue. Indeed, Behaviourism, when applied to all but very simple mental processes, is no inadequate, as to be uninteresting.

It is only in the sciences dealing inanimate matter that a reasonably adequate set of primary concepts has yet been isolated. The scientific account of our universe appears clearest and most convincing whent it deals with inanimate matter. Here we feel that the account is relatively satisfactory because it does, on the whole, meet the kind of interest we take in those phenomena. For example, the age position, size, velocity chemical constitution of a star is the kind of information we want about a star. And to be told that matter consists of little electrified particles arranged with respect to one another in certain way make us feel that our curiosity about matter has very largely been met.

But even in the science dealing with inanimate matter the concepts are unedrgoing extensive revision : which proves the limitation of the scientific method, and shows us how baseless is the hope that these concepts will ever suffice to cover the whole of experience.

Scientific, kepler and Galileo, began by quite consciously and deliberately selecting and abstracting from the total elements of our experience. From the total wealth of impresions received from nature these men fastened upon some only as being suitable for scientific formulation. These were those elements that possess quantitative aspects. Between these elements mathematical relations exist, and these men were convinced that mathematics is the key to the universe. Co-pernicus was confident that the superior charm of natural phenomena was sufficient to commend it to mathematicians. Kepler's deepest conviction was that nature is essentially mathematical, and all his scientific life was an endeavour to discover nature's hidden mathematical harmonies. Galileo, also, had no doubt that

mathomatics is the one true key to natural phenomena. In fact, he went farther than this, and stated that the non-mathematical properties are all entirely subjective. They have no existence at all a part from our sense. Thus colours, sounds, odours, and so on, exist, as much, wholly in our minds. They are, in reality, motions of some kind or another in the external world, and these motions, impinging on our senses, give rise to these sensations of colour, sound, and so on.

The importance of mathematics in scientific investigation, however, diminished in course of time. Although mathematics has hitherto proved itself by far the most powerful tool for the scientific investigation of nature, it is no longer an article of belief that Nature is necessarily mathematical. We now realise that mathematical deductions, however rigorous, must always be checked by experiments. The first fusion of the matnematical with expirical outlook was acccomplished by Newton. He adopted the mathematical method of approach, and it had led him to certain principles. But, unlike his great predecessors, he did not assume that mathematics is the one key to reality. He tried to confirm the mathematical deductions by experiments which for him were the final test.

For about two hundred years, Newton's method and his fundamental concepts, mass, force etc, were regarded as ultimate and exhaustive. It was believed that every phenomenon would prove to be explicable in terms of these concepts. But now the Newtonian outlook has been found insufficient. Sciene is becoming self-conscious and comparatively humble. We are no longer taught that the scientific method of approach is the only valid method of acquiring knowledge about reality. Eminent men of science are insisting, with what seems a strange enthusiasm, on the fact that science gives us a partial knowledge of reality,

and we are no longer to regard as illusory everything that science finds itself able to ignore. But the enthusiasm with which men of science preach that science has limitations is not really surprising. For the universe of science, if accepted as the final reality, made of man an entirely accidental by-product of a huge, mindless, purposeless. mathematical machine. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find that discovery that science no longer, comples us to believe in our own essential futility is greeted with accalamation, even by some scientific men.

The scientists now believe that science is confined to a knowledge of structure only and they do not pre-judge the problem of the nature of reality. They no loger hold the view that our response to beauty, or the mystic's sense of communion with God, have no objective counterpart. It is perfectly possible that they are, what they have so often been to be, clues to the nature of reality. In this new scientific universe even mystics have a right to exist. Thus Sir James Jeans believes that the universe is a thought in the mind of a supreme Mathematician. Mr. Eddington is of the opinion that the whole of what exists the external universe and our mind is homogeneous in nature. 'The stuff of the world,' he says', 'is mind stuff'.

Thus with the advancement of science, we are getting more and more aware of its limitations. We now know that science deals with but a partial aspect of reality, and that there is no faintest reason for supposing that everything science ignores is less real than what it accepts. This new self-consciousness of science has resulted in the recognition that its claims were greatly exaggerated. The humanistic importance of this outlook in the minds of its authors is that leave us more free to attach the traditional significance to our aesthetic, religious or mystical experiences. It does not actively reinforce any particular religious interpretation of universe, but it cuts the ground from under those arguments which were held to prove that any such interpretation is necessarily illusory.

20. ART AND MORALITY

The consideration of art has from the time of plato been an inevitable concern of the social philosophers and is coming to be recognised as of first importance for the student of social sciences. So far from being concerned exclusively with paintings in museums, poems in books and symphonies in concert halls, it is rather to be identified with the whole process of intelligent or directed activity. Used in this sense, art is distinguished from and contrasted with nature and is the name for that deliberate and controlled contrivance by which man interferes with nature in the interests of realising its instrie possibilities.

The distinction is usually drawn in aesthetics as well as in social theory, between the fine and the useful arts. The latter, including all industry, are those techniques and technologies which are practical in their results; that is, thoes which are concerned with the refinements of those or such other goods as the more complex technologies of modern machine industry. The fine arts are generally distinguished by the fact that they are not primarily valued for their usefulness or practicability, but are immediately enjoyable, the pleasure varying from a merely sensuous delight in the material to a highly intellectual pleasure in the formal pattern or arrangement and in the work of art as symbolic of something more than is immediately pre-

sented to the senses. The process of the fine arts are distinguished from those of the useful arts, especially in the mechanical and industrial forms, by a greater concern with the meanings which these materials and forms may signify.

The artist is more than an artisans, he is a creator and the process of creation is important and interesting to the artist no less, perhaps even more, than the object, created. The routine and regimental actions of an operative in a factory, compared with the considered and spontaneous technique of the painter and the musician, are cases in extreme contrast.

In the modern and more restricted sense the term art applies only to those human activities which tend towards an aestheticism—in other words, the Fine Arts and although in a figurative way, we speak of the art of cooking, the art of chase, the art of living, the art of war, and so forth, neither cooking nor hunting, nor living nor warfare would ever be seriously included in a list of art which embraces the static arts architecture, sculpture, and painting, with their sub-divisions-and the dynamic arts—music, poetry, and drama (rhytoric.)

From the beginning of speculation upon human conduct the fine arts have been subject to social criticism and review. It has repeatedly been observed by social and moral philosophers from Plato in the *Republic* down to Tolstoy in *What is Art*, that the artist by arresting attention upon the sensuous surfaces of the world promotes interest in the sense and, it has been inferred, in sensuality. So common indeed has been the suspicion that the sensuous appeal of the arts has a sexul origin and results in excite-

ment Plato, Plotinus, St. Augustine and Tolstoy, all make this capital point that the artist and his works have been looked upon with suspicion. The traditional quarrel between the artist and the puritan has been the quarrel between those who were frankly interested in the sensuous appearances and surfaces of things and those to whom any involvement or excitement of the senses was a corruption of the spirit or a deflection of some ordered harmony of reason. The history of censorship in fine arts, if it could be told in full, would be found to revolve in so small measure around the assumed peril of corruption of the spirit and the incitements of the flesh through beautiful things. As St. Augustine put it, there is or should be only one beauty, God.

The moral critique of the fine arts has flowed also, however, from another consideration. That very character of arts which is regarded as their peculiar excellence their stimulation of the imagination, their suggestion of a 'life beyond life ', their character as fictions—has been a source of disturbance to philosophers. Works of art turn the imagination away from the actual social order to some imagined and more desirable world. It was on this account that Plato counselled in the *Republic* a censorship of the arts, so that only those myths should be told, those songs be sungs, which would impress upon the popular imagination the fixed pattern of the prescribed perfect state. The artist has been justly regarded as Shelley regarded the poet, as the " unacknowledged legislator of the world " but any society makes this admission only with alarm. Just as suicide is said to have become a fashion after Goethe's Sorrows of Werther, so any form, myths, pattern of life may reduce by its imaginative compulsion and discredit the socially established, the morally conventional pattern.

At present there are two extreme views about art—art for art's sake', and art having a moral purpose. The

cult of ' art for art's sake', which had a great vogue at the end of the last century, has fallen into discrepute, not so much because of its artistic products as because of the kind of life which the devotees of this cult thought they were entitled to live. The doctrine of art for art's sake had as its corollary, not altogether logically, a doctrine of amoralism. Because they set up art above everything else the artists believed that nothing mattered except the search for beauty, and of course an alleged search for exotic beauty became an excuse for a lot of self-indulgence. The art for art's sake was expanded to a doctrine of anything for art's sake, and the art became of very doubtful quality. Nevertheless this movement started as legitimate reaction against a tendency to value art only for its effect on other kinds of human activity. To the question "What is the good of art? meaning what benefits does it procure in terms of something other than art e. g., does it make people more virtuous or healthy, the quick reply was none, but it is itself good or valuable. Art exists in and for itself, it is intrinsically enjoyable. If you were to enjoy art because it made you more virtuous' you would really be enjoying being more virtuous, and the art would be merely a means to an end. But the fact that a work of art can be treated as a means to some other end does not mean that it is by its very nature such a means. And few people would deny that they have derived real enjoyment from some work of art, whether a piece of music, a picture, a poem, a play, a novel and that they have been absorbed in it without any thought of the general usefulness of such an absorption. It has been an end in itself, something to

which could approoriately apply the rather high-sounding term of an intrinsic value. That a wo-k of art has this quality of worthwhileness cannot be proved or deduced, it only be experienced. But the overwhelming verdict of experience throughout the ages is that works of art are enjoyable in themselves. Even Plato, who banished poetry and the imitative arts, did not attempt to deny this. In fact this is largely what met with his disapproval. He did not consider this particular kind of enjoyment conducive to the life of a good citizen. That, however, is another matter and it leads direct to the second question, whether a work of art, though valuable in itself, is of no general use.

Many moralists, of course, would admit that some works, though charming in themselves, convey no moral lesson. But they go on to maintain that serious work of art should or ought to have a moral purpose. And they support their argument by attempting to show that the great classics have had such a purpose'.

Now it is possible to take a middle view and admit that there is truth on both sides, that while some works have a practical or moral value, others are quite devoid of any such quality. But the tendency among those who take this course is to regard the moral purpose as mere incidental. The important thing, according to them, is that the work should be beautiful—they may use some longer technical term such as possessing aesthetie value—but they do not consider that any harm is done by these being a moral purpose. This purpose need not necessarily relate to a particular situation, but whether the purpose is particular or general, the work of art will look beyond itself and aim at bringing about a change in the axisting order. It is contented, however, that the fact that these

are works which also aim at affecting such a change but are not works of art, indicates pretty clearly that the artistic quality is different from the practical or moral element. And while a number of great works undoubtedly possess this moral purpose, there are other quite genuine and valuable works of art which seem to have no other aim than sensuous enjoyment.

Now this middle view is right so far as it goes, but it is misleading and it does not go far enough. It is misleading in the suggestion that the moral purpose of, say, Tolstoy's *War and Peace* is merely incidental, an overtone. On the contrary, it is a very essential part of the emotional tone of the book, and it is the raw material with which the masterpiece is produced. And it does not go far enough because it takes too superfical a view of the large body of works of art which have no obvious moral or intellectual enthusiasms.

In order to clarify this point, let us consider the following wonderful lines of Keats:

> As when, upon a tranced night,
> Those green robed senators of mighty woods
> Tall oaks, branch charmed by the earnest stars,
> Dream, and so dream all night without a stir.

We look straight through the words, lovely though they are, at a wood under the stars. Our understanding and appreciation of the poetry is linked upon with experiences of everyday life and in enjoying the poetry we at the same time enjoy these experiences. It is, therefore, not a question of finding some connection between poetry and life outside poetry; the poetry takes us outside of itself and heightens our awareness, sharpens our appreciation, deepens our feeling. And so the value of poetry is clearly a value belonging to life outside poetry.

An analysis of a pictorial work would give very much the same result as that of poetoical work. The painting transports us to a world outside the picture. An Italian fresco may have a religious subject and yet actually represent the pagentry of Italian renaissance. And when we are enjoing it we are edjoying not merely this small piece of wall adoration, but also something of the Italian renaissance. What this amounts to is that, that at any rate so far as the arts of poetry and painting are concerned, the phrase 'art for art's sake' is inappropriate and misleading, because it assumes an initial gulf between 'art and experience, which doet not in fact exist. And because the enjoyment of the work of art is concentrated into a short time, it assumes that this moment is isolated and completely independent. Yet the experience that is enjoyed may stretch out far into the past and look into the future. The intrinsic character of the enjoyment is not incompatible with a wide survey of life.

The position with the non-representational arts such as music and dancing and architecture is not necessarily altogether different. We say, quite rightly, that we enjoy a picce of music for itself and not because it represents or refers to any experience outside music. And yet what is this musical experience ? It is a commonplace that the music of the different periods of history has the peculiar style of the period. So does the architecture. Each type of architecture has its own emotional and imaginative atmosphere which is linked with the general spirit and outlook of their periods.

The intrinsic character, therefore, even of the most unrepresentational art does not exist altogether apart and confine its significance to the single point of time in which it is enjoyed. The enjoyment overflows to other times exactly as in the case of representative arts. Now this has an important bearing on the question of morality and the arts. For the complete in itselfness and separateness of

what is called pure art disappears, it was on this quality that the protagonists for the independence of art and morality mainly depend. Their claim was that the work of art could have no connection with morality; it was neither moral nor immoral, and strength was lent to this view by the assumption that what was enjoved in the work of art was something completely in itself. belonging to the particular moment alone, and not looking either before or after.

Ordinary usage supports the theory that there is a connection between moral and artistic sentiments. We speak of a piece of music being gay, or passionate, or tragic, of a building being sublime or exuberant, and then we use terms of quasi moral abuse, such as vulgar estantatious or downright decadent. Now if it is appropriate to describe some works of art as vulgar or decadent, the question arises whether the work retains its artistic quality in spite of its vulgarity or its decadence, or whether there is also a proportionate lowering of artistic value. It is often claimed that a work of art, although decadent or vulgar, is still beautifnl. The assumption behind such a claim is that although a work of art can have moral qualities, yet they are still independent of the artistic merits and thus a work can be thoroughly evil and yet artistically fine.

In actual fact there has never been a work of this kind. Of course, there has been lots of ponographic stuff, but this scarcely ranks as art, because its purpose lies altogether outside the imaginative. Immorality is not merely sexual. In fact far too much attention is paid to sexual licence, and not enough to the evils of the umbridled impulses of curelty, revenge, jealousy, love of pewer, greed, vanity and egoism. No all these passions and all the emotions associated with them are elemental and primitive. They belong to the beast that lurks in us all.

Just ns an historian who reveals in all the cruel and barbarous incidents of history, extolling them and their perpetrators, would scarcely be revered as a great historian; and a politic an who openly advocates murder and assassination, corruption, lust of power and domination; would not be regarded as a great creative statesman, in the same manner, an artist who breaks the 'higher law' and reverts to the past that has been superseded, surrenders to the primitive man that we all carry within us, by expressing heartly passions, cannot he considered a great artist.

At this point it is necessary to point out an important distinction. Works of art have often been condemned as immoral because they dealt with unpleasant subjects. This is a mistake, for it is not the subject, but the attitude adopted towards the subject which is important. Dickens was a master of description of odious character, but he revealed all their odiousness and he is regarded as a moralist. It is the outlook of the artist and the subject of which he is treating that determines the quality of the work, and all through the ages, except in recent times, it has been taken almost for granted that a work of art is uplifting, contains something of a revelation, gives us a fresh insight and is eveen prophetic; and this, in fact, is in some respects true of great works of art.

---

21. IS MODERN CIVILISATION A FAILURE?

Modern civilisation is primarily the Western Civilisation dominated by the whit man. For the time over all preceding civilisation and that it had got a permanent and stable basis and thus would survive for ever, unlike

the other civilisations which had their day and then perished. But this belief has been shattered by the two world wars that have been fought in the present century and inventions of the 'A' and 'H' bomb, and other such terrible means of destruction have almost convinced every one that not only the end of our civilisation is near, but that along with it there may be the end of mankind.

Such a view was voiced by Bernard Shaw in 1932, when addressing the American Acadamy of Political Science, he remarked. "Within my lifetime our knowledge of history has been greatly extended. We used to be taught that antiquity meant the Roman Empire, which had absorbed the Greek city States—with the pyramids of Egyt looking on, and with Jerusalem and a sketchy Babylonian collection of idolators in the hinterland. The one belief that we got out of it all was that modern civilisation was an immense improvement on these barbarous times, and that all the white people had been steadily progressing, getting less and less savage, more and more enlightened, until the pinnacle had been reached, represented by ourselves. We are now beginning to have been serious doubts whether we ourselves are in any way remarkble or unprecedented as specimens of political enlightenment; for our new knowledge of history tells us that our picture of the past is false. Thanks largely to the researches of Professor Flinders Petrie, we know if five or six civilisations which were just like our own civilisation, having progressed in the same way to the same artistic climaxes, the same democratic and feminists climaxes as we; and they

have all perished. They reached a certain point and then collapsed, because they had no internal stability. When they grew into huge populations crowded into big cities, the internal strains shattered them, the civilisation sank back into primitive life for the survivers. That puts us in a very different attitude from our fathers and grandfathers, because what we are up against now is the fact that we too have reached the edge of the precipice over which these civilisations fell and were dashed to pieces. There is no mistaking the situation, the symptoms are the same; the difficulties are the same; and the possibilities of destruction are much greater. Are we to bridge the gulf or fall helplessly into it. Can we, if I may change the metaphor, steer our ship round the hinterlands on which all the ancient navigators were wrecked.

It is obvious that the warning given by Bernard Shaw, n 1932, and repeated by various thinkers of modern times as gone unheeded. The situation is fraught with graver ow than twenty-seven year agos. We are now living in a orld which is destroying itself; we are taking part in the uin of the civilisation. The dates of two world wars of ur time are filled with significance for the history of the orld, and our present misfortunes very largely result from em. It may be said that a whole historical epoch is osing and a new epoch is beginning. None of us knows hat the new epoch will be like. Often in the past the end one epoch and the beginning of new has been marked by feeling of joy; but that feeling is absent today. At the me of the Renaissance, a German humanist spoke of the

exilaration of the spirit. To-day the feeling of distress is stronger than that of joy.

At present modern civilisation is facing the biggest crisis of its history, and it is feared that it may not survive it. Mankind is brought face to face with an extraordinary paradox. On the one hand, the world had manifestly become one world; war no longer is localised, but is universal and total. The world is being made one by the press, by improvements in communications, by the cinema, by broadcasting, and in many ways of which the older societies never dreamt. In all these ways, men and societies are being brought together. At the very time, that all this taking place, however, we see the development of extreme forms of nationalism such as the nineteenth century never knew. We have on the one hand universality and on the other a national separation which is now threatening us with a third world war in which humanity may be destroyed. Indeed, Man in our day gives the impression of being in his death-agony, or very close to it, the foundations of his existence are disappearing, he is experiencing a process of disintegrations from within, rather than from without.

The principal cause of this state of affairs lies in the fact that the physical and above all the psychological make-up of man does not correspond at all to the technological civilisation of our epoch, which has developed in a way which is not only extraordinary but almost miraculous. The techological progress of the world has been unbelievable, and the inward development of man has

not kept pace with it, because the spirit of Man was formed another epoch, when he lived in harmony with the rhythm of nature and war attached to the land; whereas, today he is detaching himself more and more from the soil as a result of technological progress. We are, in point of fact, coming to end of an epoch in which the life of Man depended on the soil, and man was in harmony with Nature.

Man stands today in an altogether new relation to the cosmic forces, in a sense it may even be said that we are taking part in end of the cosmos, in that we have left behind the order of nature contemplated by Greek thought, the thought of the ancient world and of the Middle Ages which survived even in the first centuries of modern history. The splitting of the atom, the invention of the atomic bomb, symbolizes a dissolution of the cosmos in its very core. We are no longer confronted with nature considered as a whole, as the creation of God, but with something else which may be said to be no longer nature, the world as the scientists see it is altogether different from the reality of nature. We are faced no longer with what is called inorganic reality or natural organic reality, but with a reality invaded and organised by Man himself through the means of technology.

Man adapts himself with difficulty to the new technological world and its civilisation, and he suffers in the process. At the same time he is driven to adapt himself at an ever-increasing rate. Indeed, he has even very little time to bethink himself. He is called on to display immense activity, and yet by a paradox this activity on his

part involves a passivity in adapting himaelf to it, he often becomes spiritually passive. It is very curious and one of the contradictions of our time, that a very active man should be inwardly passive. Man becomes an instrument in an inhuman, rather than a human process. Not for a moment does he regard himself as having any value in himself, he is only a means towards the next successive instant. This speed is very hurtful for the soul of Man. His spiritual changes do not keep pace with the material changes around him, which are faster, stronger, and more intense. The result is a state of d sequilibrium in Man, because he cannot adapt himself quickly enough and is no longer in harmony with his time. The epoch of capitalist industrialism, has made of Man a function in the process of production leading to the alienation human nature. Man becomes a thing, he is treated as a thing and not as a human being, he is exploited by the very existence into which he is plunged.

Thus the world to-day is entering a fluid area in which there is a very little solid ground, and it is just this fluidity this inward state of dislocation, chaos and anarchy, which has led to the establishment of the dictatorships which have been so characteristic of the last years of our epoch, to the supremacy of the state which is already so strong and which is growing stronger, and which is causing so much anxiety to those who value liberty. This is a result of the two world wars, which greatly strengthened the totalitarian tendencies of States and of Governments. The instincts or tendencies which were developed in man during

the war have remained after the war; for example, tendencies towards violence, towards compulsion or contraint, towards mutual estrangement and enimity. The world seems to be entering into a condition of chaos. It is not enough to say that it is the war which itself was possible simply because this condition of chaos already existed in the heart of man. When society is drifting into chaos there is need to orgainse it, so that it shall not perish altogether. The easiest way to organise society is by coerion, and even by violence. If the mutual state of society and Man is such that no other form of re-organisation is possible, society will try to reconstruct itself by coercion.

Thus the modern civilisation is based on violence and conversion and may be rightly termed as war-making civilisation. The political States of the world are all, in greater or lesser degree, war-making institutions. Their Ministers of war are ministers of a function which is not incidental to their nature as States, but essential to it. Never is the nature of the State more clearly revealed than when the war drums are throbbing. The State speaks in the voice of the guns. States spend more of their wealth on war and on preparing for it than they spend on public health, education, or anything else. It has been shown by statistical research that the leading nations of the world have spent more on it during the last fifty years than on all other objects put together. And they are spending more on it than ever before.

On account of this constant preparation for war or actually fighting a war, the economy of the world has be-

come, in the course of history, so closely linked with the war-making functions of political States that it is in danger of being shattered in case war is abandoned. The wealth of nations has now become, pre-eminently, taxation fodder for the war-chest, as their manhood is common fodder for the battle-field. Wealth and war are a married pair, and never was the marriage so close. The industries directly engaged in the service of the war machine, in particular those producing armaments of one kind or another, are closely interlocked with industry in general. It follows that any cessation or interruption of the former will be accompanied by repercussion all along the line; from guns to butter and from atomic bombs to chocolates there will be a fall in production and in the number of the unemployed. That is why the wall Street became depressed at the prospect of peace in Korea in 1954, and the press report said, "The prospect of peace in Korea had a depressing effect on the market. Losses of one to three dollars were common among the leaders and the rest followed suit." It is clear that if the production of armaments, for defence or otherwise, ceased there would be an economic crisis. The relief to taxation would certainly be great, but great also would be the reduction in wealth of nations on which the taxation is levied.

The invention of the 'A' and 'H'bombs have made things more gloomy, and it seems that modern civilisation cannot escape the deluge any longer. The bad faith of the parties concerned, or their lack of trust in each other's good faith, renders the problem of controlling the bomb by

international agreement quite insoluble. Whatever agreements were made, or controlling authorities set up, would be broken, or the authority certainly that the agreement would be broken, or the authority defied, when one or other of the belligerents deemed it essential to its safety to do so. The armed forces, when preparations for war have made them sufficiently powerful, are apt to dominate their own government and to force on the war for which they are now ready and eager-as German army did in 1914, and 1939, and other armies, or their High Commands have often done, and doubtless will do again if they get the chance.

Thus the modern civilisation, which is basically a war-making civilisation seems to be doomed unless a miracle saves it. It has obviously failed as the preceding civilisations, and it is bound to perish, but its failure and destruction may mean the destruction of mankind, and the end of the rule of man on earth. Referring to this Prof. Toynbee, the greatest of modern histoirans, has remarked.

"On the assumption that the future of mankind is to be very catastrophe, I should have prophesied, even as lately as a few years ago, that whatever future we might be going to have would lie with the Tibetans and Eskimos, because each of these people occupied, till quite lately, an unusually sheltered position. 'Sheltered' means, of course, sheltered from dangers arising from human folly and wickedness, not sheltered from master of its physical environment, sufficiently for practical purposes, since the middle paleolithic age, since that time, man's only dangers—but these have been deadly dangers—have come from man himself. But the homes of the Tibetans and

Eskimos are sheltered no longer, because we are on the point of managing to fly over the North pole and over the Himalayas, and both Northern Canada and Tibet would, I think, be likely to be theatres of a future Russo-American war.

"If mankind is going to run amuck with atom bombs, I personally should look to the Negrito Pygmics of Central Africa to salvage some fraction of the present heritage of mankind. Their eastern Cousin in the Philippines and in the Malay Peninula would probably perish with the rest of us, as they both live in what have now become to be dangerously exposed positions.

"The African Negritos are said by our anthropologists to have unexpectedly pure and lofty conception of the nature of God and God's relation to man. They might be able to give mankind a fresh start and though we should then have lost the achievements of the last 6, 6000 to 10,000 years, what all 10,000 years compared to the 600,000 or a million years for which the human race has already been in existence.

"The extreme possibility of catastrophe is that we might succeed in exterminating the whole human race, African Negritos and all.

"On the evidence of the past history of life, on this planet, even that is not entirely unlikely. After all, the reign of man on the Earth, if we are right in thinking that man established his present ascendency in the middle palaeolithic age, is so far only about 1000,000 years old, and what is that compared to the 500 million or 800 million years during which life has been in existence on the surface of this planet? In the past, other forms of

life have enjoyed reigns which have lasted for almost inconveivably larger periods—and which yet at last have come to an end. There was a reign of the giant armoured reptiles which may have lasted about 80 million before the present day. But the reptile's reign came to an end. Long before that—perhaps 300 million years go—there was a reign of giant armoured fishes-creatures that had already accomplished the tremendous achievement of growing a movable lower jaw. But the reign of the fish came to an end.

"The winged insects are believed to have come into existence about 250 million years go. Perhaps the higher winged insects—the social insects that have anticipated mankind in creating an institutional life—are still waiting for their reign on Earth to come. If the ants and bees were one day to acquire even that glimmer of intellectual understanding that man has possessed in his day, and if they were then to make th ir own shot at seeing history in perspective, they might see the advent of the mammals, and the brief reign of the human mammal, as almost irrelevant episodes, 'full of sound and fury, signifying nothing'.

"The challenge to us' in our generation. is to see to it that this interpretation of history shall not become the true one".

22. EAST VERSUS WEST

Civilisation is normally referred to as belonging to two distinctive groups—Eastern and Western. In fact the concept of the division of civilisation into Eastern and Western has been so long in use and has so often been used by so many different classes of people, from the popular journalist to the more serious student of history and even the student of science who is used to more accurate definition of terms, that it has almost become an exiom of modern thought and language, which it would be superfluous if not pedantic, to seek to define.

And yet some definition, or approximation to it, is necessary, if we are to properly understand the points of difference and agreement between the two groups of civilisation. Orient and Occident, East and West, have, primarily, reference to cardinal points. Orient and East refer to the 'rising sun' according to the dictionary meaning and Occident and West to the opposite, the 'setting sun'. Applied to civilisation in this sense, it hardly makes any sense, Eastern Civilisation is not directed towards the sun rises and sets on every point of the equator everywhere.

Starting from a directional significance, these words soon acquired geographical association, and it is in their

geographical association that they are now generally used. The Orient or the East means usually those countries immediately east of the Mediterranean or of South Europe, which to the Romans were 'the East' countries of South Western Asia or Asia generally; and the West or the Occident means the countries of Western Europe of the Western Empire, or Europe as opposed to Asia and the Orient. Prof. Hans Kohn, in his book, *Orient and Occident,* includes in the East Turkey' Persia, Egypt, India and China. The Occident is either Europe only or both Europe and America. Russia "represents to a large extent the Orient for the Occident and the Occident for the Orient", and it "has been the meeting place of the East and the West by her history and her nature."

Besides the geographical limits of East and West, there are also their racial and cultural implications to Sociology. Prof. Willey remarked "we ourselves are living in a vast culture area that embraces the United States, Canada, England, and the Western nations of continent of Europe. It also includes some of the colonies of these nations, as parts of Australia, South Africa etc. This Euro-American culture area has centered within it a civilisation that is as readily distinguished as were the Plains, Indian, or the Eskimo civilisations. In fundamental complexes the peoples in this vast area are much alike, they are Christians, they are highly mechanised, they are nationalistic, democratic tendencies are common, their artistic and li erary efforts conform to much the same plans—their sociel heritage constitutes an immense civili-

sation. It is what we mean when we say "Western Civilisation". In this definition racial implication is implicit. The people of the United States and South Africa included in this definition are the white people. Prof. Willey makes it explicit when he later refers to Western Civilisation as "White Civilisation".

Some scholars consider "Western Civilisation", "White Civilisation". "European Civilisation" and "Modern Civilisation", as synonsmous terms, as contrasted with the Eastern or primitive civilisations. To a great extent it is true that modern civilisation is western civilisation, because this civilisation became dominant only three hundred years ago on account of the advant and development of science in Europe.

If we examine carefully the points of contrast between the Western and Eastern Civilisation we find that the distinguishing achievement of the West is science. Science has endowed Western man with power over the forces of nature beyond the wildest dreams of any previous civilisation. It has unlocked the secrets of physical world, it has given man speed and dowered him with goods, it has shed light upon the dark places of his origin and past, it has charted the workings of his body. Unlike most of man's so-called knowledge it has practical uses. It has in its power to rid the lives of human beings of dull and drudging work and their minds of supersitious fears. It has eased the grim burden of man's pain, and, what is scarcely less important, removed the overshadowing fear of pain. In a hundred ways it has brightened and cleansed human

experience, and because of it the Western world is to-day, a franker, a soner and in some ways a happier place than it has ever been in the past.

Unfortunately, however, the wisdom of the man in the west has not developed cemmensurately with his powers. Science, as Bertrand Russel has pointed out, does not change man's desires, it merely increases his power of satisfying them. For this reason, science, which has endowed the Western man with such prodigious powers, has endowed him to his peril, so much so that he is within measurable distance of exterminating himself in the next war and mechanising himself into a mere unit of droduction if he avoids of extermination.

On account of the rise of science, religion has lost its force in the West. The religion of the Western man is one which many profess but few believe, and, the more educated, the fewer. In general, the spirit of the West is markedly hostiie to religion. It distrusts supernaturalism and is aceptical of any transcendental account of the nature of the universe.

As contrasted with the Western civilisation the civilisation in the East is old and almost tottering on the verge of senility. Listlessness reigns now where life was once like bubbling spring. We are to-day drifting not advancing. waiting for the future to turn up. The is a lack of vitality, a spirtual flagging. Owing to our political vicissitudes, we ignored the law of growth. In the great days of Muslim civilisation it was quick with life, crossing

the seas, planting colonies, teaching the world as well as learning from it. In sciences and arts, in trade and commerce it was not behind the most advanced nations of the world till the middle of the millennium. To-day we seem to be afraid of ourselves, and are, therefore, clinging to the shell of our religion for self-preservation. The envelope by which we try to protest life checks its expansion."

But the eastern civilisation, whatever its other defects, hos escaped the distinguishing faults of the West. Though it knows little of machines, and material apparatus of its civilisation is of the crudest, and its residents fail to move either rapidly or f.equently over and above the surface of the earth, it inherits from its long line of seers and sages a traditional wisdom in the light of which men may live at peace and be content. It values machines in so far as it puts up with them at all, not as ends in themselves but as means to ends beyond themselves, the lightening of human toil and the increase of human leisure. Moreover, its members koow how to employ leisure. Unlike most Westerners, they can sit still and listen, they can hear themselves by themselves, and many possess the technique of solitude and are trained in the art of meditation. The civilisations of the East are very old, their roots stretch far back into the past to a time when Europe was still a cockpit of fighting savages. Referring to this fact. Dr. Radhakr shnan has pointed out "Long befor Western Europe had emerged from the Stone Age, the civilisation of Egypt Babylong, Assyria, Crete, and Chaldea had

reached a highly advanced stage. If we confine our attention to the last 6,000 years of our history and represent one hundred years by a minute of the clock.........we find that Egypt and Babylon are holding the centre of the stage when the hands are at twelve.........China, Indo-Pakistan and Media came upon the scene at twenty past twelve......At twelve forty-five we are in the beginnings of the powerful, modern European nations.

Every minute of the next ten an Empire or a kingdom goes off the map and another comes on. A few seconds before one o'clock we had the Great War".

The East is the guardian of a traditional way of life which the West has lost, the repository of certain values which the West has forgotten or never known. It is by virtue of the insight of this traditional wisdom that the West stands rebuked "A community which is almost entirely occupied with life and body, physical and economic existence, scientific and technical efficiency to the exclusion of the higher humanistic ideals of mind and spirit is not truly civilised".

But the East has also to learn much from the West, if it is to shed off its sentility, and look fresh. One can help the other so that the human civilisation as a whole, may march towards perfection. Instead of being antagonistic, they should co-operate for the greater good of mankind. The barriers between the East and the West removed and the gulfs bridged. The West has the energy and vitality of a civilisation still comparatively young,

yet does not know into what channels to direct them. Possessing in abundance the means to the good life, it is without knowledge of the end. The East possesses the tradition and the knowledge, but is without the vitality to make the tradition live or the knowledge spread, and is in danger of being swamped by the vigorous tides that flow from the West. Each lacks something that is essential, each has something to give. It is in their coming together and co-operating with each other that the future hope of mankind lies.

---

23. ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE IN RECENT YEARS

Science has made a tremendous progress in the twentieth century, and every year it is taking a step further though in recent years so many discoveries and inventions have taken place in the field of science, yet considering the limited scope of the essay, only a few very important ones, can be dealt with here.

Science has achieved great success in the field of medicine and surgery. The introduction of pencillin is an epoch making event in the history of medicine. All the older antisptics were toxic to human organism than to bacteria. The sulphonamides were much more toxic to bacteria than human organism, but they had some poisonous action on the latter. Here in pencillin the doctors have discovered a substance extremely tocic to some bacteria but almost non-toxic to man. And it not only stops the gorwth of

the bacteria, it kills them, so it is effective even if the natural protective mechanism of the body is deficient. It is effective, too, in pus and in the presence of other substances which inhibit sulphona mide activity. Pencillin has proved itself immensely effective in war casualties and in a great variety of civil illnesses. Perhaps the most striking results have been in veneral diseases, with pencillin treatment there are something like 70 per cent recoveries.

Pencillin has made medicine and surgery eaasier in many directions. The spectacular success of pencillin has stimulated the most intensive research into other drugs as gramicidine or tyrothricin, and strepttomycin. Bacteriologists and mycologists are investing into all sorts of moulds and bacteria to see if they produce antibiotic substance. The Chemist concentrates or purifies the active substance, and the experimental pathologist tests the concentrate for activity and toxity. There are teams of workers who are thus investigating every bascillus and every mould in the collections which exist in various countries. It seems likely that in the next few years a combination of antibiotic with different antibacterial spectra will furnish a drug from which few and fewer infecting bacterial will escape.

In surgery also wonderful improvements have been made. More than 96 per cent of those who were wounded in world war 11 and reached medical care, could survive on account of surgical operations. Some of the recent most astounding and successful surgical operations have been the operation of cancer of the pancreas, the removal of an entire lung for malignant disease, operation upon the

great blood vessels that spring from the heart, setting distortod blood chanels right, the cure of hypertension by removing two insignificant strand of nerve tissue from the back. The operations are not just casual occurrences, but they are inevitable of spring of brilliant marriage the union of science and surgery. Some may ask-What has seience done with surgery? Surgery means trained fingers no doubt, but without science there would be no way for that skill to operate.

Advances in surgical knowledge and skill are contumually pushing back the frontiers which have from time to time seemed definitely to bar all further progress. One such frontier, remains, one which to this time has steadily resisted all battering by surgical experiments all devices of ingenious surgical techniques which have made it possible to operate in places which seemed anatomically impossible to reach before. This increased barrier is the interior of the heart itself, the delicate valves inside it which are so often attacked by various inrections. But even in this restricted field, surgeons have come a long way. If they have not been able to operate successfully inside the heart itself, except in an occaional case which does not establish a precedent upon which to work, surgeons have learned a lot about the heart, about how it works, and in some case have been able to accomplish a great deal by changing surgically, other conditions of the circulation which affect the heart. When the surgeons began to look to the last remaining frontier, the heart, they found lot of preliminary work already accompiished. Tackling the heart surgically

means opening the chest. Positive pressure anaesthesia made long operations in the open chest possible.

One drawback to operations on the circulation is clotting, called a thrombosis, wherever a blood vessel is damaged by whatever agent, a bullet or a surgeon's knife. Thrombosis tends to close up the vessel at this point. Worse still, pieces of it break off and travel in the blood stream causing often fatal emboli to lungs and brain. That problem was solved by heparing, the clot preventing substance. Isolated chemically and now prepared for medical use it can be injected into the circulation in intermittent or continuous doses. There it decreases the clotting power of the blood to a remarkable degree, preventing the formation of thrombi where blood vesels are connected together by surgical operations, or where a great artery is opened to remove the clot which may suddenly shut off the circulation of an entire leg of a heart patient. It was a wonderful discovery, one destined to revolutionise the lusty science of blood vessel surgery.

Another very important and useful recent scientific advancement is the discovery of synthetic substances, like synthetic rubber, plastics, resins, fibres etc. This is essential because the supplies of raw materials of various types are limited and cannot cope up the ever-growing demand. "Synthetic poloymers" is a term used by the chemist for the giant molecules he has learnt how to manufacture from very simple ones. Such polymers possess very different properties compared to substances from which they are derived.

Today's synthetic ruber is the equivalent of natural rubber when fabricated into tyres for passenger automobiles. Many improvements in the processing synthetic rubber for tyres have been made in the past decade, the most interesting of which has been the incorporation of a substantial amount of petroleum in the mix. The resulting tyres are claimed to have no inferior qualities and some superior ones, to those that are oilfree. Moreover, they can be made more cheaply, and a substantial amount of raw rubber is conserved. A synthetic rubber suitable for heavy-duty tyres on trucks, buses, and other large vehicles has yet to be found. Present synthetic rubber tyres when used for this purpose are susceptible to a heat build-up that leads to excessive degradations. The eventual discovery of a synthetic rubber for this purpose is merely a matter of time.

Dozens of various kinds of plastica are now sold commercially. These vary from the clear and transparent especially suitable for ornamental purposes or for aeroplane wind shields, very though, chemical-and heat-resisting plastics for use as gaskets in chemical operations involving corrosive materials. There are resins and plastics for parts of chemical equipment, for coatings of wire to be used in the construction of small motors operating at a high temperature to produce the power of an ordinary large motor, for the waterproofing of fabrics, for finishing of wood, metals, and even stoneware. Plastics are available for all types of bristles, and others are suitable for replacement of metals even where strength is a primary factor. The future will see transparent plastics that will

not discolour and with surfaces that will not craze or scratch readily, finishes for wood and metals that will remain durable for long periods of time in the presence of sunlight and salt air, and flexible, waterproof and moisture proof film of any desired strength.

Cotton, silk, and wool have been the fibres useed almost exclusively for fabrics until a few decades ago. Rayon and acetate silk were then introduced. These are both chemical modifications of cellulose, derived usually from cotton or wood. About twenty years ago nylon, a strictly synthetic fibre,made by combining very simple molecules into a complex one similar to those nature furnishes us, made its appearance. Chiefly because of its rapid-drying properties, its durability, and its resistance to fungi and insects, it has found many applications for which natural fibres are not suitable. Natural silk, for which nylon is a substitute, has never recovered its pre-war status. The brilliant researches in Japan extending over a period of forty years, when the silk-worm was nurtured and pampered until he produced an egg-shaped instead of a peanut-shaped cocoon with a filament twice as long as formerly and of double strength, will be of no avail by the time the synthetic chemist has had a decade or more of additional exp rience. The uses for nylon have become so numerous that the demand cannot be met by production facilities. Newer syntheic fibres have appeared on the market—for example, Orlon, Acrilan, Dynel which resemble one another somewhat in properties and are all based on the same simple chemical, acrylonitrile. These fabrics are utilised particularly for seat covers, curtains, and filter, cloth in industry. These are suitable in the apparel field

because of their smart appearance, long wear, and easy laundering. Still another synthetic fibre is Dacron, which resists wrinkling, water, and moths as does no other fibre. Suits made of Decron go through rainstroms without losing their crease and can be cleansed with soap and water without losing the original shape after drying.

After the invention of the atomic bomb, scientists have turned their attention to the large scale utilisation of nuclear power for industrial and other useful purposes. Atomic reactors have been set up in various countries, for the purpose of producing energy. These are Breeder Reacters for converting weaker type of urananium into that of higher potency; Homogeneous Reactors which generate electricity; Naval Reactors which are used for supplying power to the subsarires and large ships, and the Aircrafts Reactors for propelling aeroplanes. All these Reactors are still in the experimental stage, and it is hoped that in a decade or so nuclear energy will be widely used for various purposes.

Another important invention of science is that of the machines that think. In the Middle Ages, there were few books, and it was easy for man to handle nearly all the matter that was in books. As the printing press came into use, man's brain could no longer handle all recorded information, and the effort to do so was given up. But some years ago, a brain to handle information, equipped with a moter and supporting the man and his reasoning, came into existence. This is called the controlled calculator. The thinking machines which already exist perform the various functions, viz, calculating (adding, subtracting, multiplying dividing); reasoning

(comparing, selecting); referring a (looking up information in lists).

We can expect other processes of thinking to come up to a high speed through the farther development of thinking machines. Now-a-days, when we wish to send our announcements of an even, we may copy the aderesses of our friends on to the envelopes by hand. In the future, we can see our address book as a pool of magnotic tape. When we wish to send out announcements, we put a stack of blank envelopes into the machine that will read the magnetic tape, and we press a button. Out will come the envelopes addressed. If we wish to select only those friends of ours whose last names we put down on a list, we can write the list on another magnetic tape. place it also in the machine and set a few switches, Then the machine will read the names on the list, find their addresses in the address-book tape, and prepare only the envelopes we want. If a friend's address changes, we can notify the machine. It will find old address, erase it and enter the new address.

We can foresee the devolopment of machinery that will make it possible to consult information in a library automatically. Another machine that can be foreseen would be used, for translating from one language to another, which may be called an automatic translator. We may have also the automatic typist and the attomatic s enographer, a machine that will listen to sounds and write them down in properly spelled words.

These are some of the recent advancements in the field of science, and encouraged by them we can hopefully

look forward to still greater acheivmeents.

The latest advancement in the realm of science is the launching of Satellites by the Russian and American scientists. Every effort is being made by these scientists to send a rocket to the moon. These devices of outer space travel may have far-reaching effects. Explaining these Dr. Wernher Von Braun: the German-born head of the U. S. A. guided missiles projects, who is the brain behind the explorer satellites told reporters at the International Astronautical Congress held at Amesterdam in August, 1958. "The moon rocket the U.S.A. already possesses is almost powerful enough for an interplanetary trip to Venus or Mars. The 'telegram satellites' will be equipped with tape recorders to receive signals sent up from super-speeds electronic machine which can handle impulses of a milionths of a second. A satellite passing over London will record signals from the ground station there containing all the telegram for Frankfurt, Munich, Istambul and so on. A few minutes later the satellite appears over Frankfurt, where on a signal from the ground station, it plays back all the messages for Fraukfurt and is ready to rec.ive more telegrams. A rate of only a penny a word will be enough to finance all space travel, including expeditions to the moon and mars. A little escape velocity takes you to the moon, a little more to Venice.

"The problem is that there are far greater distances involved, so guidance accuracy requirements even to get close are terrific. You may miss Venice by as much a million miles if you do not have a reasonable guidance system. I am convinced that the plan for a permanent manned satellite space station is feasible despite the recent discovery of a dangerous radiation belt round the earth".

---

24. RANN OF KUTCH

AND

BRITISH MEDIATION

Rann of Kutch is a disputed territory between India and Pakistan since the two States became independent in 1947. This area is roughly situated north of 24th parallel measuring about 16,3000 square miles. Before Partition it was under the administrative control of the British Government in Sind. The boundary between Sind and Kutch was not clearly demarcated and the former princely state of Kutch had claimed the entire Rann for itself during the British times.

After Partition, India did not take any action to occupy the area which Pakistan continued to exercise jurisdiction over and maintained a Police Post in Chhad Bet in succession of the British Indian Government.

In 1948, Indian forces under air cover ousted the Pakistan post in Chhad and forcibly occupied the post. With a view to settle the probiem amlcably Pakistan swallowed the pill and did not use force for re-occupation but confined to lodge protest with Indian Government. This emboldened power-drunk India to take the whole area by force. Intensive Indian petrolling was started in close proximity of the Pak track and she created new posts at

Vijikot, Sardar, Karimshahi and Biar Bet equipping the posts heavily. Military exercises were carried out by Indians in the area in which her Navy and Air Force participated in collaboration with the Indian land forces.

Then on the night of 4—5 April Indian forces were deployed well inside Pakistan territory and attacked Pakistan post, Ding. Pak forces retaliated severely and repulsed the Indian attack with heavy losses to the intruders, in men and armament. They retired in such a great confusion that the Indian mercenaries had to leave behind their personal effects. With a single thrashing, India dried for cease-fire in the area. This is the typical banyan mentality to attack the peaceful people and as soon as they are hit back, they will then talk everything to save themselves. Indians acted in a similar manner when they had a beating in Kashmir and sought refuge in the lap of Security Council.

Pakistan's efforts have all along been directed towards evolving a peaceful settlement of the dispute. This is evident from the fact that immediately after India's abrupt attempt to seize the Pakistani post at Ding, Pakistan on 9th April, 1965 made a three-point proposal to India envisaging (a) cease-fire on mutually agreed dates and time, (b) official talks to determine and restore status quo ; and (c) political talks to settle the Rann of Kutch dispute.

Mr. Shastri is under the influenee of fire-eating militant Hindu organisations who did not spare their own important minority—Sikhs, (and airstrif d them in Ludhiana area while they were engaged in peaceful occupation simply because they had resented the descreation of their

tample which was then handed over to a Hindu woman to use it as a place of entertainment for the Indian troops deployed in that area against Pakistan). The Pakistan proposal was turned down and Indians were not at all in a mood to realise the sanity of Pakistan's peace offer for the cessation of hostilites. On the contrary Indians inducted fresh army and thus aggravated the situation in the Rann of Katch. To this, Pak forces immediately reacted severely and unfoiled the Indian bid for military decision, this time, too, Indians pulled out in great confusion leaving behind huge arms and equipment; their slacks and lotas lap unclaimed.

In this flare-up President Jonhson of U. S. A. only expressed his concern and deplored fighting between India and Pakistan in Rann of Kutch. But he did not do any thing to ameliorate the tension.

It would not therefore be wholly untrue if it be asserted that U.S.A. is not interested in the Indo-Pak border clashes but in the sale of armament to both the belligerents only.

On the other hand British Goverment became sensitive and Prime Minister Mr. Harold Wilson began to worry, perhaps became of Pakistan's effective striking power. Mr. Wilson, however, in the name of the British Government strained that preservation of peace in the Sub-continent was an item of continuing interest to Britian and called on both the countries to exercise great restraint. Sir Morrice James, the British High Commissioner in Pakistan, flew into Delhi to consult Mr. Freemah, his counter-part in India.

Although Pakistan being a peace-loving country has welcomed the peace move by Britain, neverthless it is natural that one would like to know as to what made Britain to express her concern at the conflagration in the Rann of Kutch when the armies of the two countries have been facing each other ever since partition. The sincerity of the British Government, is beyond any doubt but why did she not act briskly and show herself up in the Kashmir issue which, in fact, is the bone of contention between these warring countries.

During the Common wealth Prime Ministers' Conference whenever Pakistan talked of Kashmir it was always crossed off the agenda. Had she taken the initiative earlier the present situation would not have arisen at all.

While the British mediators are busy negotiating peace, there is lull in the Rann, Pakistan army is not advancing from their present position while the Indian forces fire here and there from long range. The area is expected to be inundated soon by the sea water. So this lull is expected to go on for sometime.

There has cropped up a split between Prime Minister Shasrri and Defence Minister Chavan who wants to march time before accepting the British proposal. Mr. Shastri has on the other hand threatened Pakistan to open a new front of his own choice. To this Pakistan has adopted a dignified quiet. Indians are busy removing American marks from their weapons for the next offensive and Sir Morrice is shuttling between India and Pakistan.

Simultaneously, India after apparent quibbling and fighting rear-guard action, appeared to be coming around a Pakistan's view-point, viz, pulling out forces from the disputed area before truce negotiations. Sir James seemed to have broken the ice at last. But soon after, India began to pour troops into the Rann and mass troops on East and West Pakistan borders in close vicinity of the demarcated line. They violated cease-fire line in Kashmir and elsewhere, intensively and extensively, of course, with milicious intentious. Indian Government gained time by asking clarifications superfluously and putting her own inte pretation to some of the points of the British proposal. This is the old tactic which India has been using since Cripps Mission.

Shastri under the heavy pressure from the communalist opposition and Congressites in the Parliament had reversed his position. He, on 5th May, demanded an end to the peace negotiations in Kutch and said, "We cannot wait for long". According to a report from London, India intends to a blast atomb bomb, called Khadi Bomb, in the Rann. Intensive firing has been resorted by India in Lathitilla area in East Pakistan and mounted large scale attacks on three Pak posts in Kargil area which were manned by civilian volunteers.

Pakistan has therefore rightly proposed that a cease-fire agreement should precede by withdrawal of Indian troops massed all along the Pakistan borders. No peace or cease fire agreement exclusively related to the Rann issue would carry any meaning unless Indian Army quits Pakistan borders. Once the confrontation between both armies on various fronts on both the wings as well as the Kashmir

is ended, the atmosphere of distrust and tension will dissolve. Only then negotiations around a table could be fruitful in solving all the outstanding disputes including Kashmir.

The cease—fireagreement has since been concluded —Ed.

---

25. Science and Modern Warfare

Science and war are intimately connected with each other, the first instance that we have in history when science became the handmaid of war was in 212 B. C. when Archimedes, the great scientist, helped his cousin, the tyrant of Syracus, to defend the city against the Romans. Pultarch, the famous historian, giving an account of the engines of the destruction invented by Archimeds writes in his *life of Marcellus* "Before the war had begun, the king prayed him to make him some engines, both to assault and defend, in all manners of sieges and assaults. So, Archimedes made him many engines, but King Hieron never occupied any of them, because he reigned the most part of his time in peace without wars. But this provisions and munition of engines served the Syracusans marvellously at that time (when Syracuse was besieged). When Archimedes fell to handle his engines, and to set them at liberty, these flew in the air infinite kinds of shot, and marvellous great stones, with an incredible great noise and force on the sudden, upon the foot men that came

to assault the city by land, bearing down and tearing in pieces all those which came against them, or in what place so never they lighted, no earthly body being able to resist the violence of so heavy a weight, so that all their ranks were marvellously disordered. And so for the galleys that gave assault by sen, some were sunk with long pieces of timber which were suddenly blown over the walls with force of their engines into their galleys, and so sunk them by their great weight. Others being hoist up by their prows with hands of iron, and books made like crane's bills, plunged their hoops into the sea. Others being taken up with certain engines fastened with in, one contrary to another made them turn in the air like a whirling, and so cast them the rocks by the tour walls, and splitted them all to fitters, to the great spoil and murder and persons that were within them. And sometimes the ships and galleys were lift clean out of the water, that it was a fearful thing to see them hang turn in the air as they did until that, casting their men within them over the hatches, some here, some there, by this terrible turning, they came in the end to be empty, and break against the walls, or else to fall into the sea again when their engine left their hold".

Since then science has continued to play a decisive part in war. The Greeks could keep the Byzantine empire in existence on the strength of their fire arms invented by their scientists. During the Rennaissance in Europe scientists who possessed skill in scientific warfare were given high honour. Galileo get employment under Grand Duke of Tuscany, mainly on account of his calculations of the trajectories of his cannon - balls. During the

French Revolution only those scientists who had made significant contribution to the war escaped the guillotine.

In modern warfare the role that science plays is much more prominent than ever. In fact modern warfare may be termed as entirely a scientific warfare. The gallant officers and brave soliders who die heroically in the battle - field do not count for much. One nuclear physicist can cause more destruction among the enemy ranks than many divisions of infantry. Moreover apart from such dangerous weapons discovered by science, what secures success in war is not the heroic armies but heavy industries which are also products of science. During the World War II, no nation showed such feats of bravery and sacrifice as the Japanese, but they went before the Americans, because of their superiority in industrial productivity. Modern victory does not depend on material ardour, but on production of steel, oil, uranium, etc.

On account of the increasing role that science has begun to play in war, modern warfare is higly destructive. After the French Revolution France was continuously at war with the various nations of Europe for more than twenty years, but the loss of human life was nothing as compared to the loss that Europe suffered during the six years of World war II. A modern nation at war is more organised, more disciplined, and more completely concentrated, on the effort to secure victory, than was possible in the pre-industrial times, with the result that the defeat is more serious, more disorganising and more demoralising to the general population, than it was in the days of Napoleon.

The latest scientific inventions of the atom bomb and hydrogen bomb have caused new fears among the people, and it is for the first time in the history of science that the layman has begun to look at science with extreme horror. Augst 6, 1945 the day the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima—brought home to all mankind in a dramatic fashion the significance of science in human life. The impact of that bomb has left the people of the world stunned and confused, and the laymen are frightened by science as never before. The scientists are also bewildered by the power which science has suddenly placed in their hands—bewildered and humbled by their realisation of how unequipped they are, in terms of ethics, law, and government, to know how to use it.

That is the first reaction of a layman to the stupendous repercussion of that bomb on Hiroshima. And the first question that comes to his mind is this : What use are radios and automobiles and pencillin and all other gifts of science if at the same time this same science hands us the means by which we can blow ourselves and our civilisation into drifting dust. We have always been inclined to think of research and technology as being cansciously related to human welfare. Now, frankly, we are not so sure, and we are troubled, deeply troubled, by the realisation that man's brain can create things which his will may not be able to control.

One of the scientists who played a leading role in the development of the atomic bomb said to the news-papermen : "A scientist cannot hold back progress because of fear of what the world will do with his discoveries". What he apparently implied was that science has no responsibility

in the matter and that it plunges ahead in the pursuit of truth even if the process leave the world in dust and ashes. To ask the scientist to foresee the use—the good or evil of the use—to which his results may be put, is doubtless beyond the realm of the attainable. Almost any discovery can be used for either social or anti-social purposes. The German dye industry was not created to deal with either medicine or weapons of war, and yet out of that industry came our sulphur drugs and mustard gas. When Einstein wrote his famous transformation equation in 1905 he was not thinking of the atomic bomb, but out of the equation came on of the principles upon which the bomb was based. Williard Gibbs was a gentle spirit whose life was spent in his laboratory at Yale University and who never dreamed that his work in mathematical physics might have even a remote relationship to war; and yet it is safe to say that his ideas gave added power to armaments of all nations in both World War I and World War II.

The real difficulty lies in the fact that the good and evil that flow from scientific research are more often than not indistinguishable at the point of origin. Generally speaking they are by-products, or they represent distortions of original purpose none of which could have been foreseen when the initial discovery was made. We are thus driven back to a question of human motives and desires. Science has recently given us radar, jet propulsion and power sources of unprecedented magnitude. What does society want to do with them? It can use them constructively to increase the happiness of mankind or it can employ them to tear the world to pieces. There is scarcely a scientific formula or a process or a commodity which cannot be used for war purposes, if that is what we elect to do with it. In

brief, the gifts of science can be used by evil men to do evil even more obviously and dramatically than they can be used by men of goodwill to do good.

The scientists cannot, of course, be hold responsible for the dilemma facing mankind, when there is a positive danger of the extinction of life on this planet by means of the latest scientific inventions. A considerable number of scientists who were connected with the atomic bomb project have openly expressed their apperehension of the consequences of their own creation. "All of us who worked on the atomic bomb", said Allison of the Universtiy of Chicago, "had a momentory feeling of election when our experiment met with success, but that feeling rapidly changed to a feeling of horror, and a fervent desire that no more bombs would be dropped." But speaking truly, we cannot absolve the scientists from some measure of responsbility for they are men of superior training and inisigth and we are entitled to look to them for help and leadership more help and leader-ship, than have thus far been given. They should follow the example of the great scientist, Farady, who when consulted as to the use of poison gas in the German War replied that it was entirely feasible, but was to be condemned on grounds of humantity, and his opinion prevailed.

In order to save mankind from extinction which may result from use of scientific inventions for the purpose of war, somehow or other, the society must assume that responsibility. The towering enemy of mankind is not science but war. Science merely reflects the social forces by which it is surrounded. When there is peace, science is constructive. When there is war, science is perverted to destructive

ends. The weapons which science gives us do not necessarily create war ; they make war increasingly more terrible until now it has brought us to the doorstep of doom.

Our main problem, therefore, is not to curb science but to stop war to substitute law for force and international government for anarchy in the relatetion of on nation with one another. That is a job in which everybody must participate, including the scientists. But the bomb on Hiroshima suddenly woke us up to the fact that we have very little time. Now we are face to face with this urgent question : "Can education and toleration and understanding and creative intelligence run fast enough to keep us abreast with our own mounting capacity to destroy.

Bertrand Russel, one of the greatest of modern philosophers, referring to the dilemma that faces mankind today on account of the scientific inventions of the atom bomb and hydrogen bomb, has painted a gloomy picture of the future; "The atom bomb, and still more the hydrogen bomb, have caused new fears, involving new doubts as to the effects of science on human life. Some eminent authorities, including Einstein, have pointed out that there is a danger of the extinction of life on this planet. I do not myself think that this will happen in the next war, but I think that it may well happen in the next but one, if that is allowed to occur. If this expectation is correct, we have to choose, within the next fifty years or so, between two alternatives. Either we must allow the human race to exterminate itself, or we must forgo certain liberties which are very dear to us, more especially the liberty to kill foreigners whenever we feel so disposed. I think it probable that mankind will

choose its own extermination as the preferable alternative. The choice will be made, of course, by persuading ourselves that it is not being made, since (so militarists on both sides will say) the victory of the right is certain without risk of universal if so, it is to science that we will own its extinction.

"If however, the human race decides to let itself go on living, it will have to make very drastic changes in its way of thinking, feeling, and behaving. We must learn not to say; 'Never, better death than dishonour'. We must learn to submit to law, even when imposed by aliens whom we hate and despise, and whom we believe to be blind to all considerations of righteousness.

"If human life is to continue in spite of science, mankind will have to learn a discipline of the passions which, in the past, has not been necessary. Men will have to submit to the law even when they think the law unjust and iniquitous. Nations which are persuaded that they are only demanding the barest will have to acquience when this demand is denied them by neutral authority. do not say that this is easy; I do not prophesy that it will happen; I only say that if it does not happen the human race will perish, and will perish as a result of science".

26.—IS DEMOCRACY A FAILURE

The political idea of the nineteenth century, born in the American French Revolutions of the eighteenth centuay, was democracy. To be sure, there were also in Western civilisation remarkable forces working for the maintenance of the autocratic principle. But its representatives were stigmatised as reactionaries. The future belonged to a government by the people. This was the hope of everybody who believed in progress, who stood up for higher standards of social life. It was, above all, the young rising bourgeoisie which fought for this idea.

In the twentieth century, however, the intellectual political situation has changed. The immediate effect of the First World War—it is true—seemed to be a victory of the democratic principle. The newly formed states adopted democratic constitutions. The German Reich the most powerful bastion of monarchy, became a republic. But the ink on the peace document of Versailles was not yet dry when in Italy the Fascist government came into power and in Germany the National Socialist party began its victorious drive.

Together with them a new political doctrine was advocated, passionataly oppressed to democracy and proclaiming new way of political salvation, dictatorship. There should be no doubt that great attraction which the

new idol exerted over the bourgeoise intelligentsia, not only in Italy and Germany, but everywhere in the Western world. And although Fascism and national Socialism have been destroyed as political realities in the Second World War, their ideologies have not disappeared and still or indirectly, counteract the democratic creed. A more dangerous adversary than Fascism and national Socialism is Soviet Communism, which is fighting the democratic idea under the disguise of a democratic terminology.

Democracy thus stand discredited in the twentieth century. It is true that the ideals "liberty, equality, fraternity" for which democracy stands, seem to be empty words, not because they are destitute of content and of human interest, but the emotion that attaches to them is largely artificial. An active sense of liberty is only aroused when it is assailed, or else when it is directed to some positive achievement of an opportunity. Mere non-interference has no emotional value for one who has never suffered or feared interference. A slave set free to starve has no true liberty. Opportunity is needed to give a real content to liberty. A realisation of these common places is required to strip the false glamour for fine sounding words. A still more futile contribution to democracy is the term "equality". For men are not born equal, nor do they become equal in any intelligible meaning of that term. Neither in health, or strength, or intelligence, or goodness, or circumstances are they equal. It may, indeed, be held that in physical and even mental make-up they are more alike than different, and that equality of circumstances and opportunities is a sound ideal. But, the point

is that their equality and similarity are uninteresting, it is their differences that evoke our interest. It is only so far as equal opportunities bring inequalities of achievement by giving free scope to natural differences of capacity that they are valued. If equality of opportunity led to abolition of all diff rences of social status and of standards of living, though such a reformation might give some substance to the sentiment of fraternity, it would diminish the interest which attaches to inequality. In fact, inequality is only desired and valued in so far as it provides opportunity for the emergence and expansion of inequalities in nature and achievement.

In dealing wi.h the third person of democratic trinity, "graternity" the charge of unreality takes a somewhat different shape. For unlike the other two, fraternity does not make a positive appeal. It is a wild exaggeration of the feeling which men entertain towards strangers even of their own nation. Patriotism does, indeed, carry some regard for the well-bieng of other members of one's own nation, and can evoke a willingness to undergo efforts and sacrifices for the national well-being. But here the sentiment of national brotherhood is nourished and stimulated by a variety of interests and fears that arise directly from the failure to realise the wider brotherhood of man. If there were no outside nations for competition and possible conflict with our own, the sense of brotherhood in a nation would be feeble and infrequent in its appeal, ordinary feelings of sympathy and goodwill towards our neighbours would not deserve so strong an epithet. As for the wider brotherhood of man, the appeal of humanity, which inflamed the early prophets of democracy

it is a misrepresentation of the feelings of ordinary men and women towards their unknown fellows. The indifference with which almost all of us receive the tidings of some famine or other catastrophe, destructive of lives in China or Bolivia, attests the unreality of human brotherhood.

But it is not merely on account of the emptiness of the ideals of democracy, but because of certain defects in the actual working of democracies, that democracy has been discredited in the modern world. During the World War I no democratic system met its challenge effectively. Openly or covertly every belligerent state organised itself in terms of a more or less extensive dictatorship. The questions were asked whether democracy had that inherent efficieny necessary to cope with its problems whether the social question could be solved through the forms of classic democracy, whether disparities so vast as these revealed in the most advanced society could be bridged in terms of peaceful evolution. The conquest of Russia by Marxian socialism brought to power a body of men for whom political democracy was an unedifying mirage. The democratic state merely means the dictatorship of the capitalist that it must accordingly be taken from him by a revolution in which the working classes would, through the dictatorship of the protetariat, seize the state and control the means of production in the interest of the masses. Democracy for them was an ideal incapable of realisation until the power of property had been overthrown. It was only when men were economically equal through the successful socialisation of the means of production that a thorough-going dictatorship

could be abandoned.

In the feverish post-war atmosphere the dramatic Russian exercied a wide fascination, and its communist theory became the most complete challenge to the democratic principle since the French Revolution. Attempts to imitate it were frequent, notably in Hungary and Germany. Inevitably it also produced its antithesis expressed in various forms of which perhaps the most striking was the Fascist dictatorship in Italy. But underlying them all was a commoe philosophy based on the rejection of all democratic principles as involving an anarchy incompatible with the vigorous organisation required by the state. These principles, it was claimed, destroy the unity of the state. They dissipate in discussion the energy which is needed. Parliaments are overwhelmed with work so that rapidity of action is impossible for them. The average man is too incompetent and uninterested in the issues which must be decided to have an effective opinion about them. The technicality of modern problems means government by the expert, and democratic methods are held to be irrelevant to his decisions. Even the friends of democracy now doubt the validity of some of the assumptions of traditional democratic doctrine and are sceptical as to its workability in traditional forms with the present-day social environment. The point to the difficulties—material and psychological or spiritual—that democracy has to confront. They feel that the justification for democracy, as to traditionally understood, may have rested upon certain sociological and philosophical assumptions no longer accepted, and its success may have been dependent upon practical economic and social conditions that no longer prevail. They recognise that

democracy—either because of the unsuitability of the environment or the intrinsic defects of the theory itself does not accomplish actually what theory expects of it. Democracy, it is feared, suits only the conditions of small-scale industry.

Large-scale industry creats industrial disputes within the societies organised politically as democracies, and the former rather than the latter make the decisions that affect most seriously the welfare of the masses of workers and consumers. They do this directly through their power to fix the income and living conditions of the workers and the cost of the necessities of life for inhabitants generally. They determine indirectly the decisions of the agencies of democracy through their control of the means whereby the social opinion upon which democracies depend is formed. Democratic institutions, accordingly, do not solve the pressing problems for the masses in present-day industrial society. They do not remove poverty, the uncertainties of unemployment, or the wide inequalities in the distribution of wealth. Workers look increasingly to other devices than democracy when they have issues of vital importance to settle. They use the organised strength of their unions to force employers into collective bargains or they resort to some of the shorter custs of 'direct action'. Moreover, when a political democracy plays a part in settling these and other social problems, it has now to act on a territorial scope that fits the extensive units of contemporary industry. Consequently its most important agencies are so remote from the masses of people that they lose all touch with popular opinions and desires. Finally, philosophers and psychologists are no longer confident that men normally act

under the influence of their reasoning faculties. They are sceptical concerning the power of the masses of men—however well they may be equipped with democratic political agencies—to reach decisions based on rational analysis of alternative programmes of action intended to bring about that protect their interests and satisfy their desires.

Some contemporary observers hold, moreover, with many earliest writers, that popular government has not actually existed even in countries whose constitutions have been nominally democratic, that democracy has accordingly never been a valid theory, either as a political ideal or as a description of political facts. They write of the 'false assumptions' the 'receding tide', 'the impossibility' of democracy, and of the 'historical necessity of oligarchy'. The challenges of the right and the ability of democracy to survive come now from both conservative and radical quarters; and they appear in the varied forms of emotional appeal, rational crticism, and revolutionary action.

Before the World War II Mussolini and later Hitler were loud in their insistence that they had discovered the political institutions appropriate to the twentieth century, and they were the prophets of the new world order. And they lost no opportunity of proclaiming that the democracies were decadent. The charge proved to be only too true in the case of France. When military came in 1940 it completed the long process of decay caused by national divisions and political corruption. The democracies of Britain and U.S.A. did put up a heroic flight, and in the post-war world they are greatest champions of the democratic form of government. Thus

democracy has not failed though it has to bear a terrible strain from the communist quarters.

Democracy is not a perfect form of government but it is decidedly better than the other forms so far devised by men, because it only can give opportunity to every individual for self-development. It has so far met many challenges, and on its survival depends the future of the human race. Its success depends upon the existence of a civic sense among the people generally; a rational like-mindedness and an imaginative sympathy that in some degree transcend economic and cultural differences, and a general disposition among the people to put into high governmental office the sort of persons who act largely under the influence of such attitudes. It presupposes also that citizens have enough intellectual and moral vigour to withstand persistent deception by demagogues and to apply some discriminating judgements to the policies of their chosen leaders.

In the second place, democracy if it is to succeed, needs free and informed discussion of governmental affairs. The people do not govern merely by having a right to choose their governors. They must have also the opportunity to understand and criticise what these officers are doing. A democracy, therefore, requires a system of general education, an intelligent and independent press, and freedom of association and discussion. Education must be general not merely in the sense that it is available to all but also that it is not over specialised or mainly factual, and it must be a sort of supply the incentive and develop the potentialities for free and effective thinking on

political questions. Public authority must, if the private press does not, provide means for supplying the citizens with correct and intelligbile description and interpretation of aims and methods of those who hold public office. And all citizens must have full opportunity for association, discussion, and peaceful protest, democracy, is not so much the right of each to have his ideas adopted as it is the right and opportunity of each to have his ideas heard and to hear the ideas of all others.

Moreover, if democracy, as representative government, is to be competent to grapple successfully with problems of property and business control, it must secure on officialdom that is in reasonable sympathy with its economic policies. This condition cannot be fulfilled unless the ladder of education is broad enough to enable the children of the workers to enter the upper grades on the public services, central and local, in numbers approximating to their voting strength as citizens. For only thus can representative government be extended from the parliamentary into the administrative sphere.

27 THE NEED FOR THE HTIRD BLOC (MUSEIM) IN THE PRESENT- DAY WORLD SITUATION.

The present-day world is torn asunder on ideological basis. The Western countries are in the democratic bloc and the Communists form themselves into a solid bloc. The U N.O has become a sort of debating society and if not checked now it will wreck the U.N.O. like the dead League of Nations. The situation has developed to such an extent that no issue is discussed on its merit, but on whether the parties concerned fall within this group or that group.

The people of the world are divided. The democrats declare that the best thing or methed is to be found in Democracy. The Communist think of making the facilities common to all. The state exists and there must not be any private ownership . The Democrats are unable to bring forth the best types of representatives. The history of the different countries, specially of Pakistan during the past few years after Independence has shown it. The Communists have achieved success in the greater yield of agricultural products by tapping power from the hydro- electric scheme of gigantic type. But there is the materialistic out-look at the cost of spiritual peace and tranquility of mind.

In the conflict between these two blocs there has been a great war of nerves. The Muslim countries fall in-between these two blocs geographically and, we might ven ure to

say, spiritually too. The Muslims have their own ways of the administrative system. The Muslims have experience in administrative affairs. The religion is such that it has the elements of Communism plus some thing else. Islam conceives of life as equally to be enjoyed. The Caliphs of Islam have shown how to rule with authority and with love. The prayer is conducted absolutely on the basis of equality and fraternity. The two blocs need the help of Muslim states that have strategic importance. Each bloc tries to seek the support of this "block". It is absolutely necessary, therefore, for the Muslim states to work together, hold together, plan together, and execute decisions together. By holding the strategic position these states will be able to bring a check on the increased activity of either of these two blocs.

While forming the third bloc, the Muslim states must have a great ideal before them. The ideal is that of "peace" from which comes the spirit of the word "Islam". Every nation must work hard for peace. When the world is divided into various camps, it has become absolutely necessary for the Muslim states to work hard for the world-peace. The prosperity of man on earth is the aim — and the attempt must be to that end.

---

28. ANTI–SMUGGLING MEASURES TAKEN IN PAKISTAN

Smuggling is a criminal offence. From the frontier goods are sent on the other side without the knowledge the authority. The government is deprived of a big

amount as export duty. Gold and silver and other goods and valuable things are sent out into the adjacent state causing a great harm to the economy of the country. Pakistan has a common border with India. There is no natural barrier between these two countries. In East Pakistan there are certain places where it is very easy to enter into India or come back to Pakistan. Some railway stations have houses falling in Pakistan and in India.

Pakistan tried to check this smuggling. There were corrupt officers stationed at the border to check smuggling. As a result, it was necessary to employ the army. Maj. General Md. Omrao Khan as General Officer Commanding of East Pakistan started the "Operation Close Door". His operation was successful. At the different border regions the army was able to stop smuggling. Many persons were arrested with goods and Indian and Pakistani currency. Under the Martial Law Administration, the borders in East and West Pakistan were further tightened. The army stood guard at different vital points on the border. The corrupt officers were arrested and convicted. Some persons sitting in some places of Pakistan were carrying on a big business. They sent valuable products of Pakistan beginning from jute and ending in betel leaves and nuts. fishes, rice and some such things.

Huge stocks ready for sending on the other side of the border were captured. When we consider the price of the stocks we simply stagger to find that such a huge amount goes out of the country by deceiving the Government. The government coffer is affected thereby. Pakistan, therefore, adopted stringent measres to check smuggling. The persons entangled in smuggling were rounded off

enblic and severely punished. Indian goods brought into Pakistan were seized and the stock made ready for smuggling were also confiscated. The penalty for smuggling was death. Certain persons were shot dead while crossing the border with goods. When the news reached the different parts of the country, the smugglers went underground. Public sentiment was around. The patriotic feeling was also aroused. Pakistan Government now carries propaganda for the good of the people explaining the consequences of smuggling.

By adopting stringent measures and employing the Army, Pakistan has been able to check smuggling. This is our national duty to hand over to the police the persons involved in smuggling wherever we find them.

---

29. THE PROBLEMS OF THE UNDER—DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Some countries like the U. S. A., the U. S. S. R. and the U. K. and some other countries in Europe have developed a great deal due to the excellent use they made of scientific knowledge and technology. The U. K. during the 17th and the 18th centuries conquered new territories and used the huge raw materials at their disposal in those countries. These raw materials were taken by the British to their country. When it was possible for them to derive power from steam to drive huge machineries, they made use of these raw materials. By exportig finished goods, England earned foreign exchange to con-

siderable extent. During the nineteenth century, England and other countries of Europe were able to enrich themselves. They were able to raise the living standard of their people, devote scholars for research work, did social works. Thus they were able to be strong economically, politically, and socially. The ruling countries became highly developed at the cost of the dependent countries.

Soon, there existed a gulf of difference between these developed countries and the under developed countries. For a time this relationship between the ruling country and the dependent country existed with no effective protest made by the latter. But during the last part of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, these countries became restive. The First Great War sounded a grave warning. The French Revolution of the 18th century had already awakened the commonmen. The Second Wold War changed the very face of the world. The War ended with the emergence of the United Nations Organisation. The world, afer the cesssation of hostilities, was a different world. The ruling nations found it difficult to control these countries any more and subjugate them. As a result, the people, of the Indo-Pak sub-continent won freedom. Many other countries followed suit. As a result there arose the problem of the existence of these under-developed countries side by side with the highly developed countries, such a difference has been a cause for danger for future wars. These countries remain dissatisfied and may be an easy prey to different-isms in the world. There may be a new association formed by these under-developed countries under the leadership and guidance of an ambitious power in the world. Soon an-

other Great War may start. Any war started now will destroy the world, as there will definitely be the use of the atom bombs. Apart from that, there cannot be any marked difference between one nation and another. We are now growing among us the spirit of oneness as belonging to one huge family of man. No country can think in terms of her own requirements only. Nations exist now to look after the national problems no doubt. But a nation has a right to exist in relationship with other nations. There must exist among nations an international outlook. Without this international outlook no real peace can exist in the world.

The question now is, how to help these under-developed countries. The United Nations Organisation made efforts to organise social works on world-footing. We have now the World Health Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, the United Nations International Children's Emergence Fund. An immense good is being done to help those countries that need them most. So, under the aegis of the World Organisation, already a good work is being done for the good of humanity; specially the people of the under-developed countries. America and the U S. S. R., are also sending substantial help in the form of aids for the development of various sectors in the under-developed countries. There may be an attempt to win sympathy on the side of the helping nation. But politics apart, the aids given by some countries materially prosperous, will certainly make these under-developed countries attain prosperity by and by. Pakistan is an under - developed country. The British had drawn on liberally the resources

from this region. Still, the country has resources yet untrapped. With the foreign aid Pakistan is able to use her natural resources for the good of the country, thereby adding to the total happiness of the world. Many foreign experts are engaged to probe the existence of oil or mineral. Already, they have been able to trace the existence of oil, coal and natural gas. Had there been no such co-operative spirit among some fortunately placed countries, there would have been no opportunity for an under-developed country like Pakistan to develop, depending on her natural resources. The under-developed countries should be helped under the care of the United Nations Organisation.

In conclusion, we may say that there should be a united effort to help develop these under-developed countries in a systematic way. The existence of these countries is a cause of great concern for us all. There is every possibility of a world conflagration due to the existence of these under-developed countries side by side with the highly developed countries. In these days of international relationship, there is every need for similar development of the lot of all the people in all the nations of the world. The common man is the person to be helped for the good of us all.

---

30. INTERNATIONAL ARMIES AND WORLD PEACE.

Every nation has a standing army to look after the defence problems of the country. The army is also used to secure internal peace in times of internal chaos. The

army is made strong and effective. A huge lot of money is spent to build up the defence force. There are military academics for training up the nationals in a very useful manner. The army is made strong by constant vigilance. The aim is certainly to keep the political boundary inviolable. If there is a strong army in a country, there is respect and prestige for that country. But it has been sometimes that the national army of a country becomes aggressive and thereby tries to violate the integrrity of other nations. We have got examples from the history. We can refer to the First and the S cond World Wars. Germany under Kaiser, the Ex-German Emperor and under Hitler before the Second World War became very strong as a military power. Very soon the head of the state became—drunk so much so that he lost all sense of international justice and became greedy to devour the adjacent territories. This aggressive design encouraged Germany to break the nutrality of Belgium and Holland in both the Wars. So, we may say that the national army must be carefully developed so that security of the c untry is maintained. But there is the necessity to keep the national aggressive designs of a particular country under effective check.

Af er the Second World War, it has been possible to establih a world organisation namely the United Nations Organisation. Many problems—political economical, social and cultural—are discussed by the different bod es. The most urgent one to save the peace of the world is the Security Council that remains in constant sitting to hear the international disputes based on politics. During these years after the S cond World War ended, there has been

many a reference made to the Security Council for redress whenever any nation felt that another nation has unjustifiably or forcibly occupied or threatened to occupy it or a part of it. At any time in the past such disputes might have ended in a fearful war. But fortunately for us these disputes had been brought to the Security Council. The Security Council met in emergent sittings and the fight went on in the Council with argument and on voting a decision was taken. But the acceptance of the directive rests with the contending nations. There is the moral force and the force of the world opinion that help implement the decisions of the Security Council.

The question now arises as to what should happen if a particular nation refuses to be guided by the majority opinion of the Security Council. The member may secede from the U. N. O We can refer to the recent happenings at the Congo which is just a child as a young independent nation. An international force composed of the member countries had been sent there. The force entered into the Congo and occupied the state for maintaining peace and order in the country. There was the revolt of the Katanga province. Taking advantage of the situation, the province declared independence being instigated by outside influence. The international army at the disposal of the Katanga province. The army of the U. N. O. had to stop and run to the Security Council for the next move to be taken So, the international army as being constituted now is devoid of any real power to make decision on the spot. As a result it is necessary to think in terms of an international army effectively consituted under the U. N. O. This is not an easy thing as we conceive it to be. Every nation has its national army and there is

national pride for it. When there will be the creation of a standing international army, the nations will have to part with some of the power they enjoy. Every nation till have to be guided by a high moral principle basked on on international concept of co-operative existence. To have such a concept means the realisation by the States of the world that human beings are same and there should be the common aim of all the States of the world to further the cause of each individuality. To develop this international attitude, a good deal of human qualities will be necessary. But the time has come to hold such an international permanent army under the U. N. O. with summary power to deal with an emergency on a sound basis. If the nations agree, such an international army will be available to make the decisions of the Security Council effective. Without the means to excuse the resolutions of the Security Council, no permanent peace can be visualised.

The need of the moment is to have an interna ional army for the sake of peace and tranquility of the world. These are dangerous days specially because of the destructive power possessed by the atom bombs. Any moment a thoughtless nation may wage atomic wars. That will mean the destruction of the entire civilisation. We cannot afford to have that luxury to destroy the very foundation of all that is best in life. An International army will certainly be an effective check if ag eed upon by all the nations of the world to take up military responsibility in times of emergency.

31. SOCIAL REFORMERS OF PAKISTAN

Pakistan is a new country brought into being by the ideological concept of Islam. Islam is a religion which is liberal and has some outstanding modern features. The society is based on some social justice. During the British rule, there was an attempt to suppress the Muslims as much as possible. As a result Mussalmans lost social position, monetary stability and some other difficulties also cropped up due to poverty. The greater influence of the neighbouring communities, richer, healthier and politically more strong, was on the Mussalamans. As a result, the inuflence of the religion waned gradually. Supersitions and dogmatism raised their heads. The Mussalmans were a problem during the British rule. When the clarion call came to rise up from deep slumber and the slough of despond, the Mussalmans became conscious of the great necessity of reforming the society to prepare themselves to be the future citizens of a free country to be built-up on their own concept of life. This was a great task to be performed. Pakistan is established no doubt, but the established social conditions have been so bad so long.

When we consider the necessity of social reforms in Pakistan, we cannot forget the role of Sir Syed Ahmed, the great founder of the Aligarh University. He visualised the picture of a society in which the down-trodden Muslims would lead a life of glory. The Maulanas also did their best for the uplift of the society. Only their method was

a bit crude and ante-dated. But we cannot forget for contribution in warding off the onslaught of the stronger communities. The poets both in Bengali and in Urdu wrote inspiring poems, the essayists wrote different articles for pointing out the social defects. There were many such reformers of the society. In this part of Pakistan, we may remember the writings of Maulana Muhammad Akram Khan, Dr. Muhammad Shahidullah and Begum Shamsun Nahar Mahmood and others and in the West Wing we get Dr. Abdul Haq, Maulana Ehteshanul Haq, Miss Fatema Jinnah and others. But the number of social works should be great. We feel the paucity of the social workers in Pakistan. We have got a band of soldiers who have taken upon themselves the responsibility of building up Pakistan on sound basis. In this sense we may mention the name of Field Marshall Muhammad Ayub Khan, Lt. General Muhammad Azam Khan, Lt. General Burki, Ltd. General Sheikh and others with them. The great social reform has been effected by the abolition of the Zamindari system in West Pakistan. Democracy on Islamic lines could not develop due to the vested interest of these landlords who won the polls easily by virtue of their hold on the electors. This band of workers as saviours of Pakistan has brought on reforms in educational spheres. This band is trying to educate the poeple in giving a check to growing population. This is really a great social reform aimed at in Pakistan. Family planning is necessary in Pakistan to save the families from ruination. A great number of children are born to a family of small means. Th parents are unable to rear up children giving them proper food and clothing and education also. The children grew up in conditions comparable to the conditions of beasts huddled together.

We cannot allow the best creations of God to live in such ignoble conditions. God has created this beautiful world with abundance of food, air and plants and flowers We cannot allow the children to develop like beasts being deprived of the air and light and glory of the life. We cannot allow the seeds of the nation grow so carelessly. For this the family planning scheme is a necessity. But we should not use the idea in order to enjoy life refusing to take upon us the responsibility of rearing up a family. The real purpose of the scheme will be defeated thereby. We cannot allow ourselves to be selfish. What after all is the aim of the scheme? The idea is to check the birth-rate in families. Families are to be of a size within the capacity of the parents.

The social reformers have contributed a lot in formulating schemes for the uplift of the rural areas. Model villages are being developed here and there. There is the Village Aid Programm also. When we find these programmes we are elated and we become hopeful of the bright future of Pakistan. We cannot sit idle. We need social workers of the right type. We are to be conscious of the social needs. And we must have social reformers of a very great stature about whom if would be possible for us to write gloriously.

In fine, we may say that Pakistanis should be conscious of the social problems. We must have attitude and aptitude different from that of pursuing material prosperity on personal level. We hope for the great days and glorious moments in our national life.

32 THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRESS

The uses of the Press are many. Its main function is no doubt the supply of correct and up-to-date news collected from the four corners of the world. The newspapers are in telegraphic and wireless communication with all parts of the world by means of powerful Press Agencies like Reuter, The Associated Press of America. In Pakistan we have the Government subsidised Associated Press. This agency is so active and alert that nothing of note happens in any part of the world that is not at once supplied to the newspapers. When we open the morning paper we read of things which happened just at midnight in England and Australia. This regular and extensive supply of news brings all the countries of the world into intimate contacts and enables one country to learn by the example of another.

But this main use of the newspapers has been supplemented by many other functions. Newspapers form public opinion and give voice to it. The leading articles in the daily papers are written by some of the ablest men in the country and they influence the thoughts and feelings of the multitude. Then people may ventilate their grievances and express their views about any governmental measures through the agency of newspapers. Thus the newspapers bring the rulers and the ruled together. Making the former acquainted with the wishes of the latter and the latter of

the policy of the former. This is one of the greatest uses of the newspapers.

The economic and commercial uses of the Press need no stressing. Through the advertisement columns, the buyer and the seller and the employer and the employee are brought together. The Agency columns serve a very useful purpose these days. The quotations of market prices which every good newspaper publishes help to keep the price level stable and steady all over the country. The money-markets of the world depend much on the financial news collected and published by the newspapers.

The educative influence of the newspapers is no less great. The pages of the newspapers contain not only news but also accounts of scientific research past history, reviews of books, descriptions of literature, travel exploration etc.

The Sunday issue usually has a magazine section which is of educative value. There are people who read these items carefully and gain much out of their study. A careful reader of a good daily is more alert, intelligent and well-informed than the scholar who does not care for his morning paper.

The responsibilities of the Press are equally great. The journalists often forget their responsiblities. The press should always be on the side of truth and justice. Its influence on the multitude is great, therefore, this influence must be exerted for the cause of good. The press can do much to ride a country to its evils, just as it can do perpetuate them. So the press should scrupulously adhere to the former course.

Then the Press has another responsibility. It must not cater for the vicious taste of the valgar by descend ng to the sensational and lurid. Great sale may attend a trick of this kind but it hardly serves the ends of tru h and justice. The Press must educate the public, not pander to the baser instincts of its reader. Without conscientious and clean journalism we cannot have a clean moral and political atmosphere in a country. Press, the fourth estate should learn to be most responsible of a modern nation.

33. IMPORTANCE OF ENGLISH IN OUR EDUCATION

A problem that has been worrying our educationists since independence is what to do with English. English has been the medium of education in our educational institutions for the last one hundred and fifty years. It is the treasure house of knowledge of all kinds, the question is ; should English be allowed to occupy its present place or should it make place for our vernacular languages. Two opinions are being advanced as a solution to this problem. There is a group who advocates that English should be substituted by the vernacular languages. There is another group which is of opinion that English should be allowed the important role that it played before independence.

There is no doubt that with the changed circumstances after independence the educational system which we inherited from the British has become out-dated. Deve-

lopment of the mother tongue has been seriously hampered. Our students find it difficult to express their thoughts in a foreign language, whether written or verbal. On entering college they are face to face with a big change. While in schools they studied in their mother-tongue, in the college all teaching and study has to be done in English. Some students are not capable of coping with this big change and, therefore, suffer from a great disadvantage.

If one tries to analyse these difficulties, it is found that the fault lies not with English but in its teaching. If the students do not know proper and correct English, if they cannot follow class lectures and books, it is because of the defective method of teaching the language in our educational institutions. These difficulties of the students could easily be removed with proper teaching and greater attention.

Any answer to the question whether English should not be allowed to occupy its present important position has to take into consideration two important facts. The first is the advantages that has resulted by the study of English in the past. The second is our present and future needs and how far our vernacular languages can satisfy them.

Let us first consider the benefits of the study of English to the Muslims of the sub-continent in the past. Before the introduction in India of the western system of education through the English medium, muslim children mostly received education in mosque schools or madrassas. They were denied the benefits of a progressive education and their education was orthodox and conservative.

Even after the introduction of western system of education in the English language most muslims were reluctant to send their children to the new schools. They were orthodox and feared that learning a foreign language would defile their religion.

The result of this reluctance was that the Hindus, who were not as orthodox as the Muslims, continued to receive western education and to achieve enlightenment and progress. The muslims were left far behind in the race for progress in the political, economic and social life of the country.

Then came Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. He with his untiring advocacy of English language and western education opened the eyes of the muslims. He impressed upon them the need for learning English and securing western Education. The establishment of the Anglo-Oriental College by him at Aligarh which later became the Aligarh Muslim University made a very great contribution to the educational development and progress of the Muslims. The advances made by the Muslims in all fields of national life since then have been impressive. Our nationalist movement and the struggle for Pakistan owes a great deal to this progress achieved with the help of western education in English medium.

It wuld be wrong to give up the study of a language which not only has been of tremendous benefits in the past but also promises great benefits for the future.

What are our present and future needs and requirements? Our educational system is extremely theoritical. We need a more practical and scientific education. The kind of education which we need to-day is contained in

books written in foreign languages, most by English. Science, technology, engineering and medicine are what we need to-day but this knowledge can be had only by learning and studying books written in English language. We shall not be able to produce good doctors, skilled technicians and efficient engineers if our youngmen do not study Enlish at the very beginning of their educational career. The knowledge from studying English will escape us. The gap thus created would be difficult to fill.

The peace that English occupies to-day can only be replaced by another language as rich as English. Unfortunately, none of our national languages, neither. Urdu nor Bengali are so rich. It will take time for books to be written in our vernacular and till then it is necessary for us to learn English. We, therefore, must know English sufficiently to understand the language and grasp the knowledge contained therein.

English is looked upon as the gateway to world culture. It is an international language spoken by a vast number of the world's population. A large number of countrymen are everyday going abroad for higher education and specialised training. The knowledge of at least one foreign language is essential for them. And what language other than English would serve this purpose so well ?

English is also the language of diplomacy. In all world conferences English is one of the two or three languages generally used. Our international relations would be very seriously affected if we do not know English sufficiently. In many countries of the world where English was not previously taught; it is being introduced as a second

language. It would be a great mistake if we give little importance to English or banish it altogether.

In view of the importance of English it is necessary that it should be retained in its present form in colleges, universities and other institutions of higher learning. Any hasty replacement of English may be disastrous.

34. PAKISTAN'S HERITAGE

"A man is known by his past" is a saying. This proverb is very true in the case of nations. A country's present and the dreams of its future are all inspired by its past. A nation's past affords the people good food for thought. If it was a glorious, it inspires them to work for the achievement of greater glory. If it was not so glorious, it helps them to draw lessons for the future, avoid the committing of mistakes made by the ancestors and to build up a present and a future that makes up for the past and wash off the dark spots in its history. Achievements of the past in various aspects of national life which come down to the present are known as the heritage of a nation.

Since the establishment of Pakistan, a question that has been very often asked is—"Does Pakistan really have a heritage ? A small group of people seem to be of the opinion that the situations and circumstances out of which Pakistan was created deprive it of a heritage. They argue that Pakistan before partition was a part of India. Its people were Indians. Therefore, whatever Pakistan has as her heritage cannot be anything seperate and distinct

from Indians. In fact, if Pakistan at all has any heritage, it is common with that of India.

The great majority of people, however, repudiate this contention. They pointity out that the very fact that the areas comprising Pakistan decided to set up a separate state for themse'ves prove that Pakistan's heritage was indifferent and distinct from India's. For how, can a people, one in their heritage, decide to break away from each other? The two-nation theory [1] itself proves that the heritage of the Pakistan is different from the Indians. The fact that Muslims of India considered themselves to be a separa'e nation proves that there Muslims have a separate heritage from other Indians. For, how can a people not having a heritage separate from others but common to themselves weld into a nation-hood?

A careful study of Indian history will easily prove that Pakistan has a separate and a rich heritage. The Muslims came to India as conquerors and for the spread of Islam.Inspite of the attempts of some Muslim rulers and their nobles, Muslims and Hindues could not be merged into one united whole Throughout the Muslim rule, they lived as a separte community and mixed with Hindues only on the social level. This social mixing of races too was conditioned by a number of limitations. Thus the Hindu and

---

Sayyid Ahmad Knan warned the Muslims that they would be in subjection to the Hindu majorty and he was one of first to descri. be the Indian Muslim as themselves a nation. Ahmad Khan died in 1898. Thus the thesis of the "Muslem Nation" was put forward quite early. F. W. Ferna, Muslemson on the March P. 195.

The idea need not have been absent completely from Sir Sayyid's mind! Sayyid Jam l-ud-Din Afghani thought that the Destiny of the Central Asian, Afghans and Western Indian Muslims was to be citizens of a rebuplic which would embrace these area

For I. H. Qureshi. Intoduction; A History of the Freedom Movement, P 48—49.

Muslim heritage in India grew side by side but they had, with the exception of a few similarities and common points, a completely different origin and development.

The most important and prominent heritage of Pakistan lies in the glorious past of the Musalmans which is derived from the glorious period of Muslim history. The benevolent and patriotic rule of the Khalifas, exploits of the Muslim heroes, conquests of Muslim armies in the face of severe odds, and their rule over a substantial part of the globe in Europe, Asia and Africa, the proverbial Muslim unity, fraternity and brotherhood, these are the rich inheritence of the Musalmans of Pakistan. In more recent times, the benevolent rule of the Maslim rulers in India over a vast part of its territory spreading from the slopes of the Hindue Kush to the shores of the Bay of Bengal, the wealth, progress and prosperity that existed in India under these rules, provide a proud past and rich heritage. These make the Pakistanis look back to the glories of their race and inspires them to work for the achievement of the same glory and make it the goal for the future of their beloved Pakistan.

The Great Mughals did not give the Indian Muslims only a rich political heritage. The richness of their heritages is clearly seen in other fields of life too. Babur laid the foundations of the Mughal Empire in India and his bravery, his literary tastes and his determination enriched, Mughal history. His Grandson Akbar, though illiterate, is famous for his innovations in administration and Government, his toleration and keen interest in all religious and faiths, his taste for literature and his ear for music, and the numerous buildings he left behind as monuments of his reign, which even to-day inspire awe

and admiration for this great Emperor. Jahingir was famous for his administration of justice, an equal example of which is not found in any period of Indian history, Hindu or Muslim. Both Jahangir and Shah Jahan, besides buildings, have left behind as an example to the impoet of their strong character mainfested in their love for their queens, human emotions and sentiments. In fact, the Mughals have bequeatheed to the Muslims of India such a rich heritage that their age is known as the "Golden Period" in the pages of India history.

In the field of art and architecture Pakistan's heritage is no less rich. Turkish architecture is famous all the world over. This architecture was brought to India by the Mughals and its blending with Hindu architecture gave rise to a new architecture in Indian History known as Mughal architecture. The glaring and world famous example of this gorgeous architecture is the Taj Mahal Agra besides a huge number of other famous buildings of the Mughal days. The Red Fort in New Delhi, Fatehpur Sikri, the Shalimar Garden at Lahore. all remind us of the days of Muslim glory in India. It is a pity that most of these Muslim glorious buildings happen to be in India. But, nevertheless this does not deprive Pakistan of the pride of a rich heritage in this field.

In art as well as in architecture the pride of a place goes again to the Muslim Mughals. Paintings and sketches of the days of Jahangir and Shah Jahan draw admiration from all parts of the world and are admired even to-day.

The field of literature is glorious. Muslim literature throughout the centuries has been famous for its richness. Turkish and Persian literature of the Mughal days, Urdu

literature of the subsequent period is famous in the annals of literary history Bengali, one of the two state Languages of Pakistan, has a rich literature matched by few other Indian lan uages and the contributions made to it by Muslim writers have not been meant by any standards. The Punjabi language is rich in folk lore and songs, romantic poetry and the famous legends of Heer-Ranjha and Sassi Punnon.

By all standards of human understanding Pakistan has a rich hertiage in all conceivable fields of human life. It is our duty not only to preserve that heritage but also to work for the greater glory of our past and present. We must bring ourselves to the same standards which was the glory of our ancestors. We must pull the nation and country out of the backwardness and sloth in which it has been thrown by countries of foreign rule and our own laziness and mistakes.

Religion has always been the bedrock of Muslim's civilisation and culture, in which a very great stress has been laid on spiritual values. The good of life is the comminnion with the Supreme. It is a life of realisation, an inner intritive vision of good, when man achieves absolute freedom and escapes from the blind servitude to ordinary experience. It is a subtle interwovenness with the read it ies of the spiritual wored. This brings out the distinction between intellectual recogni ion and spiritual realisation. We can free ourselves from the shackles of the body and in a split second we can see the truth and be overcome by it. The record of these experiences in *the Quran*.

35. SEPARATION OF THE EXECUTIVE FROM THE JUDICIARY

After independence on the 14th August, 1947, Pakistan inherited along with India the British system so long followed in the sub-continent. Though there was the judicial department yet the magistrates with executive power had the authoity to discharge duties belonging rightly to the judicial department. While executing the duty as an execcutive officer, an officer may go beyond the limit and if the same person has the right of a judge to try cases, there will be no room for justice For the sake of generating a spirit of security among the public, it is urgently needed that the executive should be saddled with judicial power. Pakistan is an independent state and as such there must be a system of her own for the good of the people at large. We are to see whether there is the necessity for the separation of the executive from the judiciary to make a departure from the practice followed so long.

In respect of the separation of power Montesquien enunciated the principle of the separation of power in his " Esprit de Lois" . In the United States of America the power of the state has been clearly separated; but in England and in our country there is the combination of of the Executive power and the Judicial power upto the Magistracy. A District Magistrate is both an executive officer and a judge After that these separation of power is maintained. By combining the executive power with the

judicial power there has been confusion created in the administration. So, there is very danger of the misuse of power. Supposing a District Magistrate at the time of carrying on his executive duties commits excesses. At present there is nobody to question it as he has got the judicial power in him. Hence the District Magistrate has been made all-powerful in the realm of administration. There is every possibility of misuse of power, power-drunk as they sometimes may become while at the post. Hence, there has been the greatest need for the separation of power in Pakistan for the sake of equity, justice, and fair-play.

Pakistan Goveenment has decided to separate the power for the good of the people. The magistrates will be shorn of the judicial power. The munsiffs and officers of the judicial department will alone be given the judicial power. Theoretically, the munsiffs were supposed to have the power of a magistrate. But they were not given the chance to try cases. They were only allowed to try cases coming out of disputes relating to the title of the landed property. But the Pakistan Government has decided to separate the executive from the judiciary for toning up administration. The executive officers will be engaged in purely administrative duties. They will work in such a manner that the areas of the country are better administered. In order to keep the administration free from corruption and excesses committed at the time of exercising the executive power, there will be the judiciary vested with power to adjudge the cases against any executive officers. The result of such an arrangement will be the generation of the spirit of respect for the law of the country both among the officer and the public. No one will be outside the jurisdiction of the laws of the country.

Hence the judiciary will be the custodian of the laws of Pakistan. It will safeguard the future constitution of the country.

Though there is the need for the separation of the executive from the judiciary for the good of the country, yet we should think that it is not for creating the judiciary as the fault-finding body to put execvtive officers to difficulty. Montesquien himself has suggested that though separated, the functions of the different limbs of human body are unified for the common good. The executive and judicial departments are to work in a unified manner for the good of the common man and not as rivals.

---

36. PAKISTAN FOREIGN POLICY

Pakistan want to live in honourable peace. Pakistan would not be friend of a country which would want to throttle her.

The foreign policy of Pakistan has always tried to reflect the will and the aspirations of the Pakistan people. The poor people of Pakistan, the 80 per cent people of this country, are the final arbiters. You go back to Alexander, you go back to any other era of history. Circumstances and conditions have been themost eloquent compulsion of action. We cannot claim that we act in a vaccum, that we live and think in a vaccum. Undoubtedly, the circumstances and conditions have motivated and moulded our foreign policy. There are forces of events which cannot be explained. There is no logic

stronger than the force of events and, inevitably, therefore, the force of events has brought about a new situation. There was a time when the U. S. had to contain the Soviet Union. China was not the considereation in those days. The Berlin blocade and the Trumum Doctrine—all that is a thing of the past. To-day, you find the Soviet Union and the United States having some sort of equation and some sort of understanding for a world which deserves to be spared of nuclear annihilation. Now, the question and consideration here is the extinction of mankind or the survival of mankind. Now circumstances and conditions have changed internationally, the crystallisations of forces is no longer in terms of alignment and non-alignment. It is in terms of the common objective for the progress and survival of the humanity. That is why, it was possible for the President of Pakistan representing an aligned country to have a conference in Cairo with Mr. Chon En-lai, representative and Prime Minister of a Communist State, Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser, Presid nt of a non-aligned country and Dr. Ahmad Soekarno, President of another non-aligned country. Before the new crystallisation took place such meetings were confined to Tito, Nassar and Nehru. Why ? Because the world was divided in alignment and non-alignment. Whenever Tito-Nasser-Nehru met the world listened and they wanted to know as to what was happening, what were going to the declarations and what pace these leaders were to set for international relations and for international norms. Whihington wanted to hear what was the communique. Equally anxious were Peking and Moscow to know what was happening. The reason being, as the President of Indonesia termed it : "there were the old established forces as the new emerg nt forces."

The new emergent forces have now come into being and that is what non-aligned leaders can sit and talk with aligned leaders to-day. This is not accidental. It is because of the evolution of internntional relations that you find a leaders of an aligned country, a leader of a communist state, and two leaders of non-aligned countries meeting in Cairo and symbolising the heart of the Afro-Asian solidarity. The Afro-Asian solidarity means that you can have your own social system and yet come to a degree of understanding for the good of mankind. The basis of co-operation between countries is that let them live as they want to live and let us live as we want to live, but as far as the humanity and the world is concerned let us co-operate. We have to deal with Buddhists, we have to deal with Christians, we have to deal with communists and with people having their own social system, and bring about an area of agreement irrespective of the system.

There has been an honourable evolution in Pakistan foreign policy. It is better to moderate and change a foreign policy on a much more sensible and a much more national basis. Therefore, these changes have taken place without any rancour or without any bitterness against any power.

So, first of all whatever changes have been made in Pakistan's foreign policy, they are profound and have been modestly made without dramatization.

Secondly we have normalised and rationolised our relations with all the great powers. This is an important aspect of Pakistan's foreign policy. In addition we have vastly and enormously improved our relations with

France, West Germany and certain other countries of Western Europe as well as Eastern Europe.

Pakistan has tried to articulate her relations with the Muslim countries. Pakistan has taken bold initiatives to come to a process of understanding and accommodation with all her neighbouring countries including India. Geography is the most important factors of all. Geopolitics play a decisive role in deciding a country's foreign policy. It is not like an individual who if he does not like a neighbourhood can change that neighbourhood. A country cannot change its neighbourhood. So Pakistan Government has tried her best to settle differences with India peacefully but failed due to India obstinacy. Ayub Khan, the President of Pakistan said, Pakistan also wanted to live in peace with India in spite of Delhi's hostile attitude for the last 18 years. Instead of living as good neighbours the Indian leaders designed their internal and external policies so as to weaken Pakistan. But Pakistan desired peace with India in spite of outstanding disputes between the two countries, like Kashmir and eviction of Muslims from the Indian States bordering East Pakistan. But, he said Pakistan would not be a friend of a country which would want to trottle her.

Speaking at the Pakistan Muslim League Council Meeting on July 14, 1965, President Ayub said that the basis of Pakistan's foreign policy was to win friends. Pakistan, he said, wanted, friendly relation—with the United States as well as with her great neighbours, China and the Soviet Union. But, he said, friendship could not be at the cost of the country's honour and prestigue.

Pakistan, he said, would jealously guard her sovereignty achieved after 200 year's struggle; and under no circumstances would she agree to barter away her independence or accept domination in any form from any power.

---

37. INDO-PAK RELATIONS

Relations with India to us are very important and in some respect they are most important to us. Relations between Pakistan and India are of such utmost importance, as Mr. Masihur Rehman said, that war between India and Pakistan if it ever took place would be a war of special character, it would be a war which would inevitably affect the minorities in both the countries. It will affect 50 million Muslims of India and about 10 million Hindus in Pakistan. So this can be the war of grave, the most devastating and the most barbaric war that man can face. So far we have been able to hold our own despite overwhelming odds and difficulties. We have been able to hold our own, not because we are capable or efficient but because of the sacrifices made by the people of Pakistan to maintain a strong and viable Pakistan to face the Indian threat. In the ups and downs and the vicissitudes of cries we have had with India from 1947 onwards, the high water mark was reached during the Rann of Kutch dispute. This is the way sometimes history moves. It becomes uncontrollable; events get out of hand; events have their own dynamics. A time came when the whole India army was poised against the Frontiers of Pakistan and the Pakistan army had to take the counter-measures.

Those 10 mountain divisions which our Western allies had provided to India for the defence of India against Laddakh were poised against the plains of the Punjab. These very same 10 mountain divisions which we were told were meant for India's defence against the Chinese in Laddakh were poised against and were facing Pakistan. As a result a deadly and dangerous confrontation existed between India and Pakistan. Our position is that the Rann of Kutch upto the 24th parallel is disputed territory which covers about 3,500 square miles. According to us that is Pakistani territory and we have sufficient evidence and proof to establish that these 3,500 square miles form part of the territory of Pakistan. India, on the other hand, claims that the Rann of Kutch is a part of Gujrat state and it is Indian territory. That is why the dispute arose. We saw India gradually creeping into the disputed territory. So we had to take measures in our self defence. It was incumbent on us not because we wanted to go to war with India, but because we belceve in the following lines.

"We do not attack.
We do not fight,
But if anyone else
Dares show his might.

Drawing out our swords
And shouting "God is Great,"
We war and win.
We win and create :

A mighty world
Of Liberty of all
A mightier state
Of Equality of all.

With the help of the Quran
And Muhammad the almighty Musalman.

It goes without saying that war with India is most deplorable thing for any one to visualize and contemplate, but certainly we could not allow India to settle the dispute by force. Our point of view has been that we should settle all our disputes by the peaceful means of negotiations, mediation, arbitration, by recourse to Article 33 of the United Nations Charter and by any other peaceful means that is available to states. So, here we found India trying to settle a problem by military means and we were compelled to take action in defence of our own territory. We took that action.

Pakistan, without Jammu and Kashmir is a body without a head. Pakistan has tried his best to settle this dispute peacefully. But India always goes against it. President Ayub said, Pakistan also wanted to live in peace with India in spite of Delhi's hostile attitude for the last 18 years. Instead of living as good neighbours the Indian leaders designed their internal and external policies so as to weaken Pakistan. Pakistan desired peace with India in spite of outstanding disputes between the two countries, like Kashmir and eviction of Muslims from the Indian states bordering East Pakistan. But, he said, Pakistan would not be a friend of a country which would want to throttle her. Now, he said, with the increased military might of India, thanks to the help of Western Powers, Pakistan faces greater danger from India. The Rann of Kutch clash was just a demonstration of force by India. The clash showed that India wanted to settle disputes through military means. This proved that she believed in military solution of disputes. In view of this aggressive policy of India, Pakistan will be facing a difficult situation and the nation should be fully prepared to face it. The president further added : "Let our friends remember that those who cannot protect their own honour can be of no use to their friends either."

History of English Literature

Its Background and Development

By

Rashid A. Chaudry M. A.

* *

An indispensable book for all students of English Literature. In it the author has dealt with all the important and fundamental aspects of English Literature. It provides the essential background as a handy reference book. It is a 'must' book for all students of English Literature.

Rs. 7.00

* *

ADVANCED PUBLISHERS

URDU BAZAAR, LAHORE